ADVAITA VEDANTA
A BIRD'S EYE VIEW

By D. Krishna Ayyar

Advaita Vedanta

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

1. This paper has been written by D. Krishna Ayyar who has had the good fortune to listen for now over two decades and a half to his guru, Swami Paramarthananda, who has been teaching Advaita Vedanta at Chennai, India, as regular courses covering Upanishads, Bhagavatgita, Brahma Sutra and prakarana granthas. Writing started during a holiday spent with the writer's granddaughter, Tulsi, at Denver, USA, relying on memory and the very few books on the subject available in the Denver Public Library. The paper has been expanded, altered and refined on return to India with the guidance of his guru and has been checked with relevant texts. The general approach of the topics and the discussion of the philosophy are profusely based on transcriptions of the guru's recorded talks in the Vedanta classes conducted by him and doubts clarified by him. Whatever is good and right in the paper is due to the excellent exposition by the guru. Whatever errors there may be in the paper should be taken as the result of inadequate understanding on the part of the writer.

2. Sankaracarya is the first and foremost commentator of the prasthaana traya, the Upanisdhads, the Brahma Sutra and the Bhagavdgita, in the school of interpretation called Advaita Vedanta (non-dualism).The presentation in the main paper and Appendices 1 to 11 follows the methodology of teaching (prakriya) called *aabhaasa vaada*. In abhaasa vada, the jiva and Iswara, the two sentient entities on the empirical (*vyaavahaarika*) plane, formed by he reflection of the original consciousness that is Brahman in Maya and intellect, respectively, are regarded as different from and of a lower order of reality than the original consciousness that is the absolutely real (*paaramaarthika*) Brahman thus forming a secondary consciousness, a knower-consciousness, as the subject (pramaata) in the triad (triputi) of subject-instrument-object, different from Brahman-consciousness (brahma caitanyam) which is the undifferentiated, homogenous, original consciousness. It is important to bear this in mind in reading this paper, because in avacceda vaada and , pratibima vaada, there is no reflected

consciousness as a separate secondary consciousness. In avacceda vada, jiva, as pramata, is Brahma caitanyam conditioned, as it were, by the intellect and qualified by the attributes of the intellect and Iswara is Brahma caitanyam qualified by omniscience, omnipotence, all-pervasiveness, rulership etc. In pratibimba vada, also, jiva, as pramata, is Brahma caitanyam regarded as being a reflection, as it were, in the intellect and Iswara is Brahma caitanyam becoming the prototype of the jiva and acquiring omniscience etc.

a. Part I of the main paper is a preface.
b. Part II is an outline of the philosophy.
c. Part III presents Upanishad passages in which the philosophy is available.
d. Appendices 1 to 11 contain notes on various topics relevant for a deeper study of the philosophy presented in the main paper. Some of these are explanatory notes; some are meant for reflection of the teaching (mananam.)
e. Topic I of Annexure is a discussion of the main prakriyas (methodologies of teaching), particularly in regard to the status of jiva and Iswara - the abhasa vada, the pratibimba vada and the avacceda vada.
f. Topic II of the Annexure gives details of the manner in which Sankaracarya, Sureswaracarya, Vidyaranya, Vacaspati Misra and Prakasatman have dealt with the topics of creation, jiva, Iswara and Maya.

3. The reader may find a lot of repetitions. The approach is to start with a simple presentation, and introduce refinements later. Repetitions are meant to see that the topic discussed in different places is self-contained.

4. Questions concerning doubts are welcome. Please click on the "Ask a question" link on top of the page. Answers will be attempted by the writer to the best of his ability.

5. Transliteration of Sanskrit words in the text is put in italics, when they occur for the first time. Diacritical marks have not been used, but when the Sanskrit words occur for the first time, a rough indication of the pronunciation is given. Subsequently they appear in the form usually found in English texts.

TOPIC I: THE HINDI SCRIPTURE

We all ask questions regarding ourselves, the world that we experience and the Lord, such as –

- ***Who am I? Am I the body? Am I the mind?***
- ***What happens to us when we die?***
- ***What is the nature of the world that we experience? How did it come into existence? Will it have an end?***
- ***Is there a creator? Is there some one like a Supreme Lord? Are there more than one God?***
- ***What is our relationship to others, the perceived world and the Lord or the Gods?***
- ***What is the purpose of life?***

1. Like other philosophies, Advaita Vedanta deals with such questions. It is a unique philosophy. The uniqueness consists in (a) the assertion that the sole reality is a supreme principle of existence cum consciousness cum infinity, called brahma (spelt as Brahman in this paper) which is identical with the consciousness of individual living beings called aatma and (b) the relegation of the universe perceived universe (jagat) to a lower order of reality.

6. The original Hindu scripture called Veda (consisting of about 20,000*, mantras* (hymns) is divided into four compilations, called (a) Rig Veda, (b) Yajur Veda, (c) Sama Veda and (d) Atharva Veda. Respectively, the earlier portions of these Vedas consist of (a) hymns (*mantras*) in metrical or poetic form, (b) a manual of rituals including hymns in prose form (c) hymns in musical form and (d) miscellaneous matters. Together, these portions are called Karma Kanda. The latter portions of the Vedas, called Vedanta or Upanishads or Jnana Kanda are the philosophical portions. Karma Kanda deals with (a) rituals and sacrifices (b) worship of deities and prayers (c) duties, values of life, and conduct of life in harmony with the welfare of all living

beings, with the requirements of society and with the structure of the universe (called karma) and (d) meditation (*upaasana*) on aspects of the cosmos in the form of deities (*devatas*) and on the Supreme Lord, the creator and ruler (Iswara). There is a lot of codified and clarificatory literature called *sutras* (aphorisms), and elaborating these, there are *smritis*. Whereas *Brahma Sutra* deals with the Upanishads, the others deal with karma kanda. Related to karma kanda there are *dharma sastra sutras* dealing with the duties and responsibilities of and the values to be cultivated by individuals*, grhya sutras* dealing such matters in relation to the family, *srouta sutras* focusing on the welfare of the society, with a description of rituals and prayers for the well-being of the society, universal harmony and peace. There is also literature consisting of commentaries called bhashyams, and these, in turn, have a chain of sub-commentaries. Such of these that are in verse form are called vartikas. There are also interpretative works on various topics called Prakarana Grandfathers. All these together are called Saastra.

2. Pursuit of Karma Kaanda is the preparation for the pursuit of Jnana Kanda. Karma Kanda prescribes various kinds of karma and upasana and mentions the corresponding mundane benefits to be obtained, such as wealth, health, progeny, acquisition of superhuman powers (called siddhis), life in higher worlds, etc. When they are performed with the purpose of obtaining the material benefits, they are called kaamya karmas. In the initial stages one does kaamya karmas. But, in due course – it may be after many births (called janmas) – one finds out that whatever benefits kaamya karmas give are temporary. Even life in a higher world is, according to Sastra, temporary. .The foolish way of seeking happiness is to develop desire for objects. No pleasure is unmixed with pain. In fact most of the time, it is pain. Struggle and strain and anxiety in acquiring things, the worry of protecting what one has acquired and the sorrow when it is lost or ceases to be – all this is nothing but pain. Happiness is only there in a fleeting moment when one has got a thing one wanted and desire for another or a higher thing has not arisen. There is no end to desire. One desire arises after

another. One is always hankering after something better. Satiation sets in. The law of diminishing returns operates. If going to a picture once a month is enough, to begin with, you reach a stage when you want to go daily and even that is not enough later. Your sense faculties undergo wear and tear by the enjoyment and one becomes mentally a slave of the objects and physically a wreck. The wiser way of having happiness is to develop dispassion for objects (vairaagya). Vide Isavasya 1 – "Protect yourself by giving up desire." Experiencing the problems of seeking happiness through contact with objects, one begins wondering whether it is possible to have permanent peace and happiness. Sastra comes and says, "Yes; it is possible. Leave the kaamya karmas and come to Jnana kanda."

7. (a) Before taking to Jnana kanda, one has to prepare oneself for it. The subject is subtle and the study requires calmness and concentration of mind. Calmness or purity of mind and concentration are acquired, respectively, by the performance of karma and upasana without desire for mundane benefits and solely with a view to going to Jnana kanda. This is called *nishkaama karma*. This is a way of life where the attitude is significant. Whatever action one does, religious or secular, is done as an offering to Iswara (*iiswara arpana buddhi*) and acceptance of results, favorable or unfavorable with equanimity as the sacred gift of Iswara (*iiswara prasaada buddhi*) This is called karma yoga. Karmayoga engenders purity of mind (*citta suddhi*) and upasana calmness and concentration of mind (*citta aikagryam* and *citta naiscalyam*) and desire for *atma vicaara* (enquiry into the nature of self), which are required for the pursuit of jnana kanda.

   (b) Sastra prescribes what is called varnaashrama dharma – four successive ways of life and four vocations. The four successive ways of start with brahmacarya ashrama in which boys and girls chant the Veda mantras and, studying Sanskrit get a general idea of what the Veda says. They also study auxiliary subjects, called vedaangas (siksha, kalpa, vyaakarana, nirukta, and chandas,

and jyotisha – pronunciation and intonation, methodology of rituals, grammar, and eymologolical explanation of difficult Vedic words, prosody and astronomy. Starting at the age of five, the study is to be done under a preceptor (guru), staying with him for a period of twelve years. (This is called gurukulavaasa). This is followed by grahasthaasrama in which one, after marriage, functions as a priest, teacher, warrior, trader, or agriculturist (in one of the four varnas, called respectively, Braahmana, kshatriya, vaisya and sudra.) Women who have not chosen to pursue jnana kanda get married and look after the household. When one has had children, to the eldest of whom one could hand over the responsibilities of the joint family one adopts vaanaprastha aasrama in which one retires with one's spouse to the forest for doing upaasana. The last is sanyaasa aasrama during which one devotes time exclusively to a deep study of Vedanta (Jnana kanda). This is again done under a guru ; this time the guru has to be one who is not only well versed in Vedanta but is himself also one abiding in Brahman (srotriya brahmnanishtah). There are two type of sanyasa - *vividishaa sanyasa* – which is taken for devoting undivided attention to sravanam, mananam and nididhyasanam.

(c) Going through grahastha asrama and vanaprastha asrama is not compulsory. Those who have obtained sufficient purity of mind (citta suddhi) and dispassion (vairaagyam) and concentration (citta aikaagryam) and have developed a keen desire for liberation (mumukshutvam) after the brahmacarya asrama itself can, be it boys or girls, straightway take to sanyasa asrama, or, without going through grahastha asrama, continue study of Vedanta. (They are called *naishtika brahmacaris* or *naishtika brhmacaaarinis*). (Vide Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.20, where two types of sanyasa are mentioned, one after grahasthasrama and vanaprastha and the other straightway from brhamacarya). (In Jabala Upanishad also, it is said that one takes grahasthasrama after brahmacarya, vanaprastha asrama after grahasthasrama, sanyasrama after vanaprastha and as an alternative, one can straightway take sanyasrama after brahmcarya. In today's economic and social milieu, it not possible to adhere to the ancient system of varnasrama dharma involving a regular succession of ways of life and a clear division

of vocations. Gurukulavaasa has become obsolete and there is no time for a householder to perform the elaborate rituals prescribed in Sastra. However, even in modern society, even if there is no ceremonial assumption of asramas, the sequence of the main activity in life is not different – one engages in study first, then discharge one's duties in the chosen profession, not omitting prayer and worship and if one is intelligent, devote the time after retirement to spiritual pursuits. Even in modern circumstances, though formal rites may not be possible, it is possible to devote some time to a limited regimen of worship, prayers and meditation, to the extent the preoccupation of earning a living will allow. One has also to perform one's duties to others, to society and to nature. Further, one should pursue one's profession in the spirit of follow the path of karma yoga and lead a life based on values, such as truthfulness, non-violence, austerity, charity etc. Above all, one reduces worldly pursuits to the minimum required for life and devotes time to spiritual pursuits. If one is talented, the talent should be put to use for the welfare the society, nation and the world, after providing for the requirements of one's own family. Whatever surplus wealth accumulates should be spent in charities.

3. The major part of the original Vedic literature has been lost by disuse and destruction during invasions. According to tradition, Vedanta literature originally consisted of 1180 Upanishads. What are extant are 108 or so. Of these what are considered most important are twelve Upanishads. Of these, widely taught are ten, viz., Isa, Kena, Katha, Prasna, Mundaka, Mandukya, Aitreya, Taittiriya, Chandogya and Brhadaranyaka, for which the great preceptor, Sankaracarya has written invaluable commentaries. Two others that are popular are Kaivalya and Svetasvatara. (Some say that the extant commentary of Swesvatara is also Sankaracarya's.) Mandukya is the shortest Upanishad and Brhadaranyaka is the biggest. Mandukya is studied along with an explanatory treatise called "karika" written by Sankaracarya's teacher's teacher (paramaguru), Gaudapadacarya. Apart from the Upanishads, all students of Vedanta

study the Bhagavadgita and Vyasacarya's "Brahma Sutra". As foundational texts, they are called, "Prasthaanatraya".

8. According to tradition, the literature of the Vedas including Vedanta is not works of human authorship. It is revelation from Iswara; vide Kaivalya Upanishad 22 – "I (Brahman) alone am the theme taught in the different Vedas. I am the revealer of the Vedanta and I alone am the real knower of the Vedas." Swetasvatara IV.9 – "Mayii (Brahman, through his power, called Maya, creates Veda ...." (The word, 'Mayii' should be interpreted, preferably as Iswara, since creation is mentioned). Revealed by Iswara, Veda exists in a subtle form, as a part of the creation. It has been grasped by sages (rishis), whose special mental equipment acquired by upasana has enabled them to find out what is there is subtle form. (The word, 'rishi' is derived from a root which means 'to see'; so rishi means one who sees). The Veda has been transmitted to successive generations in a teacher student tradition. This is called "guru sishya parampara". Vide Swetasvatara Upanishad V.6 – "The *brahmatvam,* the principle called Brahman) is hidden in the Upanishads which constitute the gist of the vedas. (- 'Hidden' means that it can be known only by those who do sravana manana in depth). Hiranyagarbha knows them (the Upanishads). Knowing them, Devas and rishis have become immortal". Since the teaching was oral, not written, the Veda is called *sruti*. Since it is not of human authorship it is called "*apaurusheya pramaana*". The rest of the sastra is of human authorship, the work of sages and saints, and it is called "*pourusheya pramaana*".

4. In its fundamental teaching, Vedanta deals with matters beyond creation. Human intellect itself is a part of creation. It cannot therefore prove or disprove what is said in Vedanta. Cf. Kathopanishad I.ii.8 and I.ii.9 – "It (Brahman) is beyond argumentation." "This wisdom.....is not to be attained through argumentation." Kenopanishad I.3, I.4 and I.6 – "The eyes do not go there, nor speech nor mind. We do not know Brahman to be such and such." " That (Brahnan) is surely different from the known and again It is above the unknown." "That which man does not comprehend with the mind". Taittiriya

Upanishad II.ix.1 – “That…Brahman, failing to reach which words turn back along with the mind”. Faith – I. e., the wholehearted belief that Upanishads teach us is incontrovertible – is essential. So a student of Vedanta goes primarily by what is said in the Upanishads as interpreted by preceptors (acaryas) whom he has chosen to follow. Logic is used to analyze topics based on data gathered from Sastra to arrive at a harmonious construction of the texts (called “samanvaya”) and to be convinced of the credibility of what is arrived at (sambhaavana yukti).

TOPIC 2: OUTLINE OF ADVAITA VEDANTA

Section 1 - Nature Of Self. Changing And Unchanging Consciousness Distinguished

9. Let us start with finding answers to the questions raised in Part I. Whatever you perceive or know as an object cannot be yourself. It is not difficult to understand that I am not the physical body. I can see the body. So, no thinking man will deny the fact, "I am not the body." "Am I the '*praana*' (divided into *prana*, *apana*, *vyana*, *udana* and *samana*), I. e., the life forces that are responsible for the respiratory, circulatory, assimilative functions etc.? I am aware that I am breathing. I am aware that I am hungry etc. So, I am not the prana. . Am I the '*karmendriyas*', the sense organs of action, i.e., the faculties of speaking, lifting, walking etc? I am aware that I am speaking, walking etc. So, I am not the karmendriyas. Am I the '*jnanendriyas*,' i.e., the sense organs of perception, i.e., the faculties of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch? I am aware that I see, hear etc. So, I am not the jnanendriyas (A single name for the jnanendriyas and karmendriyas put together is '*indriyas*' – sense organs, in English).

10. Next, we have to find out about the mind. In Sanskrit, the mind is called '*antahkarana*'. Along with the antahkarana, there is reflected consciousness called *cidaabhaasa*; for the two together, the name is ahamkara. Ahamkara comprises *manah* (the faculty which receives stimuli from the outer world and is the seat of emotions and feeling), *buddhi* (the faculty of reasoning, decision, speculation and imagination), *citta* (the faculty of memory) and the *ahampratyaya* or *ahamartha* (ego) (the 'I' thought, the sense of 'I am the knower, doer' etc.). (In what follows, for the sake of simplicity, in many places, the word, mind, is used as a synonym for ahamkara. Where the word, 'mind' is used for antahkarana alone, it will be obvious in the context). (The physical body is called, *sthoola sarira*. The prana, the indriyas and the ahamkara are called "*sukshma sarira*". The prana that continues to function during deep sleep and the *indriyas* and

ahamkara that lie dormant in the deep sleep state are, together, called "*karana sarira*.") (In Sastra, the word, "ahamkara" is used not only for the combination of antahkarana and cidabhasa, but, in some places, for the 'I' notion alone. To avoid confusion, in this paper, following Sureswaracarya, the word, *ahamartha*, is used for the 'I' notion and the word, ahamkara is reserved for the combination of antahkarana and cidabhasa.)

11. The existence of oneself as a conscious entity is self evident. The question is "is the mind itself the conscious self or is there a conscious principle other than the mind? Am I the mind or am I the other conscious principle?" To find out whether I am the mind, I should apply the same test as applied earlier in regard to the body etc. That is, do I experience my mind? The mind is an entity that expresses as thoughts in the form of cognition of external objects, emotion, reasoning, decision, speculation, imagination recollection and conceptualization. "I know the pot is a thought" (Thought is called '*vritti*' in Sanskrit.) "I am angry at my son" is a thought. "I had ice cream yesterday" is a thought. "Black hole is a mystery" is a thought. Am I aware of my thoughts? The answer is "yes; I am aware of my thoughts". Not only that, I am aware of the I that is engaged in the thoughts in the form of cognitions of objects, emotions, reasoning, decision-making and conceptualization. When I perceive a tree, I am aware that I perceive the tree. When I entertain a desire for, say, ice cream, I am aware that I desire to have ice cream. When I get angry, I am aware that I am angry. When I have an idea for designing a new computer soft ware product, I am aware that I have that idea. When solving a mathematical equation, I am aware that I am solving it. If I have learnt Chinese, I am aware that I know Chinese. When I recall anything I am aware that I am recollecting it. Knowledge or cognition produced by ahamkara (whether it is cognition of external objects or internal conceptualization) involves the cognizer (*pramaata)*, the cognizing instrument and process (*pramaanam*) and the cognized object or conceived idea (*prameyam*). This set is called *triputi* . In the case of action, the agent of action is called *karta*. In the case of enjoyment, the one who enjoys is called *bhokta* and so on. For example, in "I know the pot" or in "I have an idea of what black hole is", the I is the pramata. In "I am repairing this clock" the "I" is the doer - *karta*). In "I am enjoying the

music", or "I am sad about what happened in Kashmir." or "I am sad at what my son is doing", the" "I" is the enjoyer or sufferer - *bhokta*. In "I am a father", the I is a related individual – *sambandhi*. In "I have a house", the "I" is a possessor - *dhaarin*. Not only am I aware of the premeyam and the pramanam of the triputi but the pramata etc., the I's that are pramata, karta, bhokta, sambandhi, dharin etc. as well of the objects which these I's perceive, the acts that they do, the things that they enjoy or suffer from, emotions that they have and the ideas that they conceive. Our thoughts, including these I's are changing from moment to moment. One thought arises, stays for a while and disappears and another thought arises and so on. Thoughts arise in the mind. We do talk of the mind as the entity that survives and travels after death or the mind in a dormant state in deep sleep state. When we do so, we look upon the mind as a continuing entity. But this is only flowing continuity (*pravaaha nityatvam)*. Thoughts and the mind are closely connected. Like a photographic plate which gets altered by the light and shade patterns reflected by the object being photographed, the thoughts occurring during the course of our experience of the external world and thoughts occurring inside in the mind independently leave impressions in the mind (*vaasanas*). The vasanas alter the character of the mind. Just as tissues are replaced and the body of old age is not the body of youth, the emotional and intellectual personality undergoes change. For example, a person who acquires wealth becomes a proud man. A person who becomes angry for everything we characterize as a person with a short temperament. A dullard in school turns out to be an inventor in later life. In other words, the personality undergoes change. So, it is clear that the mind undergoes change. The question is, "Is there an awareness of these changes of the mind and if so how does that awareness take place?" That which changes cannot itself be aware of the changes. It follows that, besides the changing mind, there must be a changeless conscious principle. The question is, "what is the proof?" The proof lies in the fact that, in spite of the changes of the mind, I regard myself as the same conscious entity. Yesterday I was angry. Today I am calm. The angry mind and the angry I disappeared yesterday. The calm mind and the calm I have come only today. But I regard myself as the same person while saying "I was angry yesterday; I am calm today". Yesterday I was

struggling with a mathematical problem. Today I have happily solved it. The struggling mind and the struggling I disappeared yesterday. The happy mind and the happy I have come only today. Still, I regard myself as the same entity while saying, "I struggled with the mathematical problem yesterday; today I have solved it." This will be clearer when we compare the personality-change over a period of time. When you meet a school-mate whom you knew as an aggressive, selfish boy after a period of thirty years in Sabarmati Asram, you may find a social worker with a calm temperament, but he regards himself as the same person. That means that there is a changing I and an unchanging I. The unchanging I, the constant I that I invoke while making such statements as mentioned above is an unchanging conscious principle. This unchanging conscious principle is the immutable atma. It is also called *saakshi* since, when it is invoked as the constant I, it looks as though it was the witness of the changing mind. It is also called *pratyagaatmaa*, since it is recognized by us without the mediation of any knowing instrument. Whereas the mind is experienced, the atma is not experienced; it is only invoked as the constant I. The invocation is done by the mind; the invoked is the sakshi.

12. This process of connecting a past condition of the mind and the present condition is called "*pratyabhinja*". We can observe pratyabhinja in situations connecting the dream state (called "*swapna avastha*") and deep sleep state (called "*sushupti avastha*") on the one hand and the waking state (called "*jaagrat avastha*") on the other. In the dream state, the mind projects its vasanas to form a dream world which it cognizes as objects existing outside it. When one wakes up, one realizes that what he saw as a world perceived world existing outside one's mind were merely thoughts in one's mind. Thus, one says, for example, "last night I dreamt that I got a lottery of one million rupees but now I know that I don't have a paisa". Again, this constant I that is invoked by this thought as having existed during the dream and as existing now is the sakshi.
13. Similarly when one in a state of dreamless sleep (*sushupti*), the mind is bereft of any kind of cognition, emotion and conception. The ahamkara is dormant. But when one wakes up, one says, "I slept happily; I did not know anything" ("*sukham aham aswaapsam; na kincit*

aveditam”). Suppose you ask that person, “When you were sleeping were you conscious of yourself ?”, he will say “ I did not know that I was there”. The non-knowingness and the happiness are recollected when one wakes up. But the “I” that he is referring to, while saying “I slept happily; I did not know anything” cannot be the dormant ahamartha. The “I” that he is invoking must be an “I” that was present even when ahamartha as a part of ahamkara was dormant. This is the sakshi I, the changeless consciousness. Thus, when we analyse sushupti, we can recognize the changeless consciousness, the sakshi, the atma, distinguished intellectually from the changing consciousness, the ahamnkara. The invocation of the changeless consciousness, when one wakes up, as the “I” that was present during sushupti, is done by the changing ahamkara, but the invoked ‘I” is the changeless consciousness, the sakshi I.

14. *S*akshi is not the knower-consciousness. So, it is not the entity cognising the state of non-experience in sushupti. Ahamkara, the knower-consciousness is dormant. But on waking up, there is recollection of the state of on-experience. So, what is the explanation? Though, in sushupti, the ahamkara is resolved and is non-functional as a cognise or conceiver, it retains the capacity to register its own non-knowing and non-thinking condition. It also registers the *sukham* (happiness) occurring as a reflection of the *anantatva* aspect of atma in the state of calmness in which the ahamkara is in sushupti, though it is not aware of it at that time. It is on the basis of such registration by the resolved ahamkara that the ahamkara is able to say, when the person wakes up from sleep, “I slept happily; I did not know anything – “*sukham aham asvaapsam, na kincit avedisham*”. Even so, the I that is referred as having existed during sushupti is, as explained above, not the ahamartha, the ahamkara I, but the sakshi I. The further point to note is that the source of happiness registered by the ahamkara in sushupti is neither an external object nor internal recollection; there is no contact with external objects and the memory is also non-functional. The only entity continuing to function is the atma. For the happiness that is registered in the resolved ahamkara, the source can only be the atma. The infinitude of the atma is reflected as *poornatvam* translating into happiness in the resolved antahkarana and this is what is registered in the resolved ahamkara.

1. Pratyabhinja invoking a constant I is also observed when we connect different stages in our life. Our body and mind are changing entities. When one is young, one is strong and healthy and can win a cross country race. When one becomes old one needs a stick even to walk. In early age, one can recite the entire Bhagawadgita and Upanishads from memory. When one becomes old, one doesn't remember even the name of his dearest friend. In one's youth one is arrogant. When one has become old, one has become humble. In spite of these differences, one is regarding oneself as the same I. The I that is invoked here is the unchanging I, the unchanging consciousness, the sakshi.

15. Recognition of the unchanging consciousness can also take place without a vritti. Suppose you are listening to Swamiji's talk in the class. In your mind the modifications of the mind registering the sound ("*sabda vrittis*") and understanding the meaning corresponding to the words of Swamiji's talk are taking place. At that time you are not entertaining the thought "I am sitting here and listening to Swamiji's talk." The mind can have only one *vritti* at a time. Next day, if somebody asked you "did you attend Swamiji's class yesterday", you would say "yes". That means that you were aware of the fact that you were sitting and listening to Swamiji's talk without entertaining a *vritti* that you were sitting and listening. This shows that to be aware of your own continued existence as a conscious being does not, necessarily, require a *vritti*. Recognition of a continuous I without a *vritti* is possible only if there is a constant consciousness other than the momentary consciousness of the mind, a constant I that exists even when the mind is absorbed in thoughts relating to an external occurrence and is, therefore, not in a position to entertain an *ahamartha vritti*. When Swetasvatara Upanishad 3.19 and Kaivalya Upanishad 21 say, "It sees without eyes, It hears without ears", they are referring to this sakshi.

Section 2 - Brahman, The Ultimate Reality

16. The central theme of the Upanishads is Brahman, called also *Paramaatma*. It is a conscious principle. The word for conscious principle in Sanskrit is "*caitanyam*". The consciousness that is Brahman is called "*brahma caitanyam*". The seminal sentence defining Brahman which occurs in *Taittiriya Upanishad* (II.i.1) is "*satyam jnanam anantam Brahma*." In English, this is translated as "existence-consciousness-infinity". The words 'Existence', 'Consciousness' and 'Infinity' are not three separate entities; they are three words denoting the nature of the same entity. The word, 'satyam' is synonymous with the word, *sat*, used in Chandogya Upanishad VI.ii.1 –*bhooma vidya* – in the sentence "In the beginning (i.e., before creation) existence alone was there, one only without a second. (*Sadeva soumya idam agra aasiid ekam eva advidiiyam*)" The words, "satyam" and "sat" are defined as that which is eternal and has independent existence. Juxtaposed with the word "*anantam*" (which means "the infinite"), the word ("sat*")* distinguishes it from localized existence and denotes all pervasiveness. In the sentence, "The word, "jnanam" in this context, means the undifferentiated changeless consciousness as distinguished from ahamkara which functions as the differentiated knower-consciousness, ("*pramaata*")", for the words "in this context", substitute "juxtaposed with the word, ("*anantam*")".

The word, "jnanam" is juxtaposed to show that it is not an insentient entity but is Consciousness. The word, "jnanam", in this context, means the undifferentiated, changeless consciousness as distinguished from ahamkara which functions as the differentiated knower-consciousness (*pramaata*). (In Sanskrit, 'jnanam' denoting Brahman is called '*swaroopa jnaanam*'; the knowledge obtained by the pramata is called '*vritti jnanam*'.) The word, anantam is juxtaposed to show that It is a not a limited entity. The word, "anantam" means infinity. 'Infinity' denotes what is infinite not only in terms of space but in terms of time and entity. Infinity, space wise indicates that It is all pervading ("*sarvagatam*"). Infinity time wise indicates that It is eternal ("*nityam*"). Infinity entity wise indicates that It is non-dual ("*advayam*"), i.e., besides It, there is no other real entity. Since it is all pervading, it is formless ("*niraakara*"),

divisionless (i.e, without division) ("*nirvikalpa*"), devoid of movement ("*acala*") and devoid of parts ("*niravayava*"). Since it is eternal, it is changeless ("*nirvikara*"). Since it is non-dual, it is relationless (i.e., without any kind of relation) ("*asanga*"). In some places, Brahman is also defined as *saccidaananda*.; it is a compound word consisting of " *sat* " which is the equivalent of " satyam ", " *cit* " which is the equivalent of "jnanam " and " *aananda* " which is the equivalent of " anantam".

17. In his commentary on the Taittiriya Upanishad mantra, Sankaracarya first clarifies that the sentence, "satyam, jnanam, anantam brahma" is meant as a definition of Brahman not one that denotes the attributes ("*guna*") of Brahman.......Satya is a thing which does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own. .... (To indicate that It is not the insentient material cause) it is said that Brahman is consciousness. (Used along with the words 'satyam' and 'anantam' - infinitude) – The definition excludes the concept of the agent of knowing. If Brahman be the agent of knowing, satyam and anantam cannot be part of the definition. If it is the agent of knowing, It becomes changeful and as such It cannot be satyam and infinite. That indeed is infinite which is not limited by anything. If It be agent of knowing, It becomes delimited by the knowable and the knowledge. Chandogya VII.xxiv.1 says, "The Infinite is that where one does not know anything". The words, 'satyam; 'jnanam' and 'anantam occurring in mutual proximity, and restricting and being restricted in turns by each other, distinguish Brahman from other objects denoted by the words, 'satyam' etc. In his commentary on the Chandogya mantra, Sankaracarya explains, "The word '*sat*' means mere Existence, a thing that is subtle, without distinction, all pervasive, one, taintless, partless (i.e., without parts), consciousness, which is known from all the Upanishads. The word '*eva*' is used for emphasis. (*Sadeva – sat iti astitvamaatram vastu nirvisesham sarvvagatam, ekam, niranjanam, niravayavam, vijnaaanam yat aagamyate sarvavedantebhyah. Ekasabdah avataaranaarthah*)...Before creation, it was not possible to grasp it as possessed of name and form. ....By the words, 'One only', is meant that there was nothing else coming under the

category of its product. …….'without a second' means that It (Existence) has no second thing different from Itself".

Section 3 - Identity Of The Individual Self And Brahman

Atma conditioned by the sthoola sarira and the sukshma sarira is called *jiivaatma* or *jiiva*. There are various Upanishad passages which talk of Brahman, the all pevading consciousness, *Brahma caitanyam*, as being available for recognition as the atma behind the mind in the jivatma. The Upanishads also expressly state that Brahman is not only non-dual ("*advayam*") but divisionless (i.e, without division) ("*nirvikalpam*" "*nishkalam*"). Further, we have the definition of Brahman in Taittiriya 2.1 as 'satyam, jnanam, anantam' where each word governs and is in turn governed by the others. The words, 'sat (existence)' and 'jnanam (consciousness)' governed by the word, 'infinitude' means that Existence-Consciousness is all pervading. This means that both existence and consciousness is the same in all things and beings, though, for recognition of the consciousness, a particular medium may be required. 'Therefore Advaita Vedanta says that the atma, the unchanging consciousness, in you, in me, in other human beings, in gods (*devas)*, in demons (*asuras*), in the animals, the birds, the insects, the plants and, in fact, in all living beings, whether they are denizens of this world or other worlds, is identical with the non-dual, divisionless, infinite Brahma caitanyam. . Brahman and atma are not different. They are just two words for the same entity. There is only one unbroken, undivided, all pervading consciousness ("*akhanda caitanyam*"). When the focus of teaching is on the all pervading aspect, it is generally referred to as Brahman and when the focus is on the same consciousness recognized in the jivatmas, it is generally referred to as atma or pratyagatma. When the focus is on the source of cidabhasa, It is referred to as sakshi. Thus it is none other than the Brahma caitanyam itself that is invoked as the unchanging, constant I by a pratyabhinja vritti.

Section 4 - Knower - Consciousness – Reflected Consciousness (Cidaabhaasa)

18. In the definition of Brahman as 'satyam, jnanam, anantam', as mentioned earlier, since the word 'infinitude' governs the word 'satyam' and 'jnanam', the consciousness aspect as well as the existence aspect is all pervading. But we see that what we call inanimate objects like table, chair etc. are insentient, whereas living beings are sentient and the antahkarana of a living being functions as a knower. What is the speciality of living beings? Being a knower involves limitation, because knowerhood excludes the knowing and the known. The jnanam that is atma recognized as atma (the *atma caitanyam*) in living beings cannot be the knower, because if atma is the knower, atma will become limited; this is not possible because the word, 'jnanam' is governed by the word, 'infinitude'. Moreover Upanishads talk of Brahman as devoid of the instrument of objectifying knowledge (*amanah). So*, we have to conclude that the antahkarana of a living being has a special capacity to become the knower-consciousness. By itself, the antahkaram, evolved as it is from the inert elements, is non-sentient. We have also specific passages to show that mind is a product of food (vide Chandogya 6.5.4, 6.6.2. 6.5.5). So we have to conclude that in the presence of atma caitanyam, mind becomes the knower-consciousness. The atma caitanyam is reflected in the antahkarana and the antahkarana becomes the knower-consciousness. This reflected consciousness is called *cidaabhaasa*. It is cidabhasa, together with antahkarana that functions as the knower-consciousness; the original Brahma caitanyam, just by its presence, enables the antahkarana to acquire cidabhasa. Cidabhasa undergoes modification along with the antahkarana. Without cidabhasa, the antahkarana cannot perceive objects, cannot know, cannot think, cannot react, cannot recall cannot theorize and cannot imagine. The mind, in turn, lends the cidabhasa to the sense organs and the body; that is how the mind, the sense organs and the body become sentient. As mentioned earlier, the combination of antahkarana and cidabhasa is called ahamkara. Since antahkaranas are many, ahamkaras are many. Each one of us has a separate ahamkara, functioning as separate

pramatas, kartas, bhoktas, etc. The reflected consciousness *pratibimba caitanyam*) of abhasa vada is different from atma caitanyam and is of a lower order of reality than the atma caitanyam.

1. The ahamkara perceives the external perceived world through the sense organs and cognizes one object after another and entertains one thought after another. While the recognition of the existence of oneself as a constant conscious entity, as the same person, in spite of the changes which the body and ahamkara undergo cannot be explained without the atma, the perception of particular objects or entertainment of particular thoughts, one after another, cannot be explained without ahamkara. And it is the ahamkara that cognizes differentiated objects of the external at one time and differentiated of objects of a dream world at another time and becomes dormant at a third time. Atma is there all the time, without undergoing any of these changes. If the mind was not there and the changeless atma alone was there and the changeless atma were a knower, there would be permanent, simultaneous perception of everything together (which will be utter confusion). If the changeless atma (which is apramata, i.e., which is the non-objectifying consciousness) was alone there, without ahamkara, there would be no cognition or conception at all.

Section 5 - Transmigration and Karma

19. Another fundamental tenet of Advaita Vedanta – indeed of all schools of philosophy in Hinduism – is that the sukshma sarira with cidabhasa in it survives the death of the sthoola sarira and is involved in transmigration from one world to another among the fourteen worlds (*lokas*) mentioned in Sastra and entry into different sthoola sariras in successive births (*janmas*). Associated with this tenet, there is the theory of karma. According to this, for the actions and thoughts of jivatmas they incur what are called "*punya*" and "*papa*" (merit and demerit) and have to undergo, and the punya and papa have to be discharged as *karmaphalam* in the form of enjoyment or suffering in future janmas and, sometimes, some part of it in this

janma itself. The punya papa account is a running account to which additions are made by actions and thoughts and subtractions take place on account of enjoyment and suffering. The accumulated punya papa account is called "*sancita karma*", the punya papa incurred in the current janma is called "*aagami karma"* which is added to the sancita karma and the quota of punya papa which has fructified in the sancita karma and assigned to be exhausted in a particular janma is called "*praarabhda karma"*. In accordance with praarabhda karma, the jivatma's next janma may be as a celestial or a god in one of the lokas superior than the earth or as an asura or some other denizen in an inferior loka, with different kinds of sthoola sariras, or again, on earth, as a human being or as a plant or an animal or insect or microbe. Jivatmas and karma are beginningless (i.e., without a beginning, without a prior non-existence) (Svetasvatara Upanishad IV.5 refers to jiva as *aja,* i.e., birthless). Therefore, questions such as "what is the cause of the first janma?" i.e., "how can there be a first janma with different people being different in various respects unless there was a preceding karma?", "how can there be karma without a previous janma?" do not arise. Only a theory of karma and rebirth can explain the phenomenon of prodigies or morons or babies afflicted with congenital diseases unconnected with heredity and the wide disparity in physical and mental equipment, health, wealth, joy and suffering of living beings and, in the case of human beings, we find that there is no correlation to the virtues and vices and actions and thoughts of the current janma. Moreover, if you say that a person is born and dies once for all, and that there is no rebirth, when a person undergoes enjoyment or suffering, you cannot explain it, because there is no punya or papa for which the enjoyment or suffering is undergone. The other way, for the actions and thoughts of a person, the punya papa will hang in the air without reward or retribution, if there is no rebirth. Last but not least, if you say that the Lord created persons with varying patterns of physical and mental equipment and comforts, enjoyment and suffering, then that would make that Lord partial and cruel. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, IV.iii.9 talks of a man having two abodes, this and the next world and the dream state as the junction staying in which he surveys the two abodes, this and the next world. We do get strange dreams, dreams of things we have never experienced in this

janma. They must be arising out of *vaasanas*, (i.e., impressions formed by the experiences) of the previous janmas. Similarly, on the eve of death, it is said, that a man has a glimpse of his next janma. Even a baby has dreams. Where are the previous experiences for it to have formed vasanas, unless it had previous janmas? Another argument for the karma theory is the well known fact that the mind, though conscious of consequences wills evil; and though dissuaded by reason, it does engage in deeds of intensely sorrowful consequences. Since everybody wants only happiness, if there was no vasana of evil pertaining to previous janmas, evil will not exist in the world at all.

20. The cycle of action and thought, punya and papa and births and deaths is beginningless. This cycle is called, "*samsaara*". (A single word for punya and papa is "*karma*"). It is one's own punya papa alone that determines the enjoyment and suffering (*karmaphalam*) in our lives. Iswara only arranges the environment, events and situations required for the working out of the karma of the multitude of jivatmas. He is only the administrator (called "*karmphalahdaata*").

1. Samsara is related to ahamkara. When we identify ourselves with the body mind complex and, in the ignorance of our real nature as the relationless atma, regard ourselves as karta and bhokta we are involved in the samsara. When we disidentify with the body mind complex and identify with the atma that is non-different from Brahman, karma is destroyed. And there is an end of samsara.

    (a) The concept of rebirth and karma is available in Brahadaranyaka Upanishad, Katopanishad and Prasnopanishad. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.IV.vi and IV.iv.ii – "The jiva who has attachment goes along with his karma to the world to which his sukshma sarira is attached. After exhausting the karmaphalam for whatever he has done in this world, he returns to this world for further karma. Thus does the man with craving (transmigrate)".´When it departs…….it is followed by the karma and upasana done by him and the vasanas he has acquired:" . Kathopanishad II.ii.7 – " Some embodied ones enter (after death) into (another) womb for assuming bodies. The extremely inferior

ones, after death attain the state of motionless things like trees etc., in accordance with each one's actions and thoughts". *Prasnopanishad* III.7 – " Uadana, in its upward journey (i.e., the sub-division of prana that carries the sukshma sarira, travelling after the death of the sthoola sarira),leads (the jiva) to a virtuous world as a result of virtue, to a sinful world as a result of sin, and to the human world as a result of both." ("*punyena punyam lokam nayati papena papam ubhayam eva manushyalokam*). (When a person dies, the presiding deities of the indriyas withdraw from the sense organs. So, when he travels to the next world, after death, the physical sense organs are non-functional. So, until he takes rebirth in one of the worlds and the presiding deities return to the sense organs there is no memory or enjoyment - vide Brahadaranyaka 4.4.1 and 2.). Kaivalya Upanishad 14 says, after enjoying the 'ignorannce-cum bliss state of sushupti, the jivatma returns to the dream and waking states, as a result of its association with the karmaof previous janmas.

(b) According to tradition, to know what is good and what is bad, we have to go by what is prescribed in the Sastra. In Sanskrit, good and bad are referred to by the terms, "*dharma*" and "*adharma*", respectively. What is enjoined as duty is called "*vihita*" and what is prohibited is called "*nishiddha*". In so far as the religious rituals are concerned, we have tom go solely by what is said in the sastra, but in regard to the secular duties and values, like truth, nonviolence, austerity, restraint of greed, love of fellow beings, elimination of hatred, respect for and care of the animal and plant kingdoms, living in harmony with nature, regard for ecology and service to society, the commands and prohibitions of sastra are in line with what is generally recognized as do's and don'ts by humanity in general.)

Section 6 - Free Will

21. It is not karma alone that governs human life. There is scope for free will (called "*purushaartha*") in human lives. Good action and good thought can mitigate the papa and

enhance the punya content of the prarabdha. Whether free will or prarabdha will be more powerful, i.e., to what extent free will can mitigate the suffering or enhance the enjoyment to be undergone as prarabdha depends on the relative strength of prarabdha and free will. Since there is no way of knowing what one's prarabdha is, wisdom lies in doing good actions and entertaining good thoughts. One should not lose faith in the efficacy of good actions and good thoughts; good actions and good thoughts are bound to bring about a better balance of punya papa in prarabdha. What physical and mental equipment one is born with, in which set up one is born, what situations one has to face and what opportunities are available are determined by one's prarabdha. But, in any janma, how one develops one's potential, how one reacts to situations, and how one makes use of opportunities depends on one's free will.

Section 7 - Status of the World - Orders of Reality

1. Now, let us consider the nature of the world. From what we see around us, information obtained from others, inference and scientific investigation and scientific theories, we know that the universe that we experience is a vast, complex entity; the human body itself is a miraculous mechanism; the vegetable and animal kingdoms, the planets, the stars, the galaxies, the black holes, the particles, the waves, matter, antimatter and what not – are all miracles. There is no effect without a cause. So, we cannot but postulate an omniscient and omnipotent creator.

22. Upanishads state expressly in various passages that Brahman is non-dual ("*advayam*" "*advaitam" "advidiiyam"*, "*ekam*"), eternal ("*nityam*"), all-pervading ("*sarvagatam*") divisionless ("*nirvikalpam*) *"nishkalam*") and changeless (*nirvikaaram*). A non-dual, changeless entity cannot be the cause of any product. But we do experience a world. The all-pervading Brahman, the Existence, has to be there in the world that we experience. But since it is not objectifiable (*aprameyam*), we do not perceive It. We can explain the presence of the all pervading Brahman and It not being the cause of the world only if we say that the part we

perceive in the world belongs to a lower of reality. (Hereafter the term ‘perceived world’ or ‘perceived universe’) should be taken to refer to the part of the world that we perceive, though the universe consists of not only what we actually perceive but the unperceived sub-stratum, Brahman, the Existence. So, a cardinal doctrine of Advaita Vedanta is the scheme of three descending orders of reality, – “p*aaramaarthika satyam*” (absolute reality), “*vyaavahaarika satyam*” (empirical reality) and “*praatibhaasika satyam*” (subjective reality). Brahman is paramarthika satyam. It is the sub-stratum (adhishtaanam) of the universe. The part of the universe including our bodies and minds that we perceive is vyaavahaarika satyam. It is of a lower order of reality than Brahman. Why? When Brahman is said to be non-dual as in Chandogya, Brhadaranyaka, Mandukya etc. (cited above) or said to be infinite as in Taittiriya (21), Kathaopanishad (1.3.15), and Swesvatara (1.9, 5.1,5,13) there cannot be a second entity of the same order of reality. Therefore, apart from Brahman as Existence, that part of the world that we perceive has to be accorded a lower order of reality. When we talk of the perceived world as vyavaharika satyam, it includes the bodies and minds of living beings. Orders of reality lower than Brahman are covered by the technical term, “*mithya*”. For the absolute reality of Brahman and the mithya status of the perceived world the Sanskrit expression is “*Brahmasatyam jaganmithya*”. Things like snake seen on the rope, silver seen on the shell, the dream perceived world etc, are pratibhasika satyam. The experienced dream world is also pratibhasika satyam. Objects that are erroneously perceived even while one is awake, such as serpent perceived on rope in semi-darkness, silver perceived on the shell, mirage perceived on the sandy terrain of the desert are also “pratibhasika satyam”. Mithya can be either vyavaharika satyam or pratibhasika satyam (Mithya common to all is vyavaharika. Mithya perceived by a particular person and not by others is pratibhasika.) Mithya is defined as that which is cognised but which has no independent existence and is subject to change. The perceived world, which is mithya, is a superimposition on Brahman, the sub-stratum (adhistaanam) viewed in its aspect of Existence. Mithya cannot appear without an adhishtaanam. Erroneously perceived snake cannot appear if there is no rope. The dream cannot appear unless there is a waker. (‘Waker’ is a technical term

used for a person who is dreaming and takes the dream world to be real but realizes that it is unreal when he wakes up from sleep.) If there were no sub-stratum of Existence, we would not experience a world. If there is no superimposition of the perceptible part of the world on the sub-stratum, then also we would not experience a world. Another definition of mithya is that which can neither be said to be existent nor said to be non-existent. (The technical word in Sanskrit is "*anivacaniiya*"). The dream world is experienced by the waker while he is dreaming but the world perceived in the dream is negated when the waker wakes up from sleep. The snake is perceived on the rope in semi-darkness but it is negated when light is flashed on the rope. The mirage is negated when we go to the spot in the desert where we perceived it. We do perceive a world; so we cannot say that it is non-existent. When the adhishtanam, Brahman is known, the perceived world is negated, i.e., regarded as mithya and at the paramarthika level, there is no experience at all of a world. so, we cannot say the perceived world is existent. (When the word, "satyam" or "real"is used without any adjective, hereafter, it should be taken to refer to paramarthika satyam and when the word, "mithya" or "unreal" is used without any adjective, it should be taken to refer to "vyaavahaarika satyam" or "pratibhasika satyam", depending on the context.).

Section 8 - Creation

23. According to Advaita Vedanta – indeed all schools of Hindu philosophy – there is a beginningless and endless cycle of creation, maintenance and dissolution or resolution, called "*srishti*", "*sthithi*", "*laya*." Cf. Swesvatara Upanishad I.9, where the omniscient (referring to Iswara), the one with limited knowledge (referring to jiva) and Maya (which transforms into the perceived world) are said to be birthless. In each srishti, the variety and pattern of objects, the attributes of the bodies and minds and the events and situations have to be fashioned to suit the karmas of the myriad of sentient beings that have to undergo their karmaphalam in the course of their janmas during that srshti. This requires conscious planning and skilful action on the part of the creator. According to Sastra, Brahman is eternal and changeless. In various passages,

Upanishads state that Brahman is eternal ("*nityam*"); "nityam" implies changelessness. In Muktikopanishad and in the *Bhagavadgita* (*Gita*, for short), Brahman is specifically said to be changeless. In Brahma Sutra bhashyam II.i.14, Sankaracarya says that Brahman is changeless and eternal and it has been denied that Brahman can undergo any modification whatsoever. Upanishads also say that Brahman is devoid of instruments of action and thinking (*karta amanah*. There are also statements in the Upanishads to the effect that Brahman is neither neither cause nor effect. A changeless Brahman, a Brahman that is akarta, cannot be the transforming material cause (*parinaami upaadaana kaaranam*) of the perceived world. Since Brahman is amanah, It cannot be the intelligent cause ("*nimitta kaaranam*.") of the perceived world, either. So, the question arises, how does creation come? The universe is a combination of Existence-Consciousness and matter. Existence-Consciousness, which is Brahman, is the eternal unchanging sub-stratum. Matter in its various and divergent forms and functions arising from the permutation-combination of attributes is called *naama roopa* (name and form or names and forms). Advaita Vedanta says that in Brahman, there is, as a lower order of reality, a mithya, *anivacaniiya* entity, called "Maya". The Nama roopa is contained in Maya in seed form. Brahma caitanyam gets reflected in Maya, to constitute an entity called "*Iswara*". Thus Iswara has the caitanyam aspect and the matter aspect. In this combination, Iswara is omniscient (*sarvajnah*), omnipotent (*sarvasaktimaan*) and all pervading (*sarvagatah*). Therefore Iswara has in himself the capacity to think, visualize and plan creation and the raw material for creation. Creation is the unfolding or differentiation of the nama roopa existing in seed form (*avyakta* or *avyakrta* nama roopa becoming *vyakta* or *vyakrta nama roopa)* and their superimposition on the changeless sub-stratum. The sub-stratum is real The nama roopa are unreal. The differentiation and superimposition is done by Maya under Iswara's guidance. When the differentiated Nama roopa are superimposed on Brahman, the Existence-Consciousness, the universe is manifested. The sub-stratum is real; the superimposed nama roopa is unreal. The substance, the essence, is the sub-stratum. The superimposed nama roopa are attributes. A rough comparison is the clay which is substance and the pot shape which is an

attribute. But there is a difference between the comparison and the compared in other aspects. One of them is this - whereas clay, the substance is tangible and the pot shape, the attribute is intangible, Brahman, the substance is imperceptible and the nama roopa are perceptible. Nama roopa superimposed on Existence-Consciousness consist not only of the attributes contributing to the manifestation of what we regard as inanimate objects like shape, color, smell, taste, texture, weight, mass etc. but the attributes which contribute to the manifestation of bodies and minds of living beings, like shape, mass, weight, color, smell, taste and texture are the attributes contributing to the manifestation of the experienced universe as inanimate outside objects but the attributes of our bodies and minds, like the biological structure and functions and the mental faculties of cognition, emotions and thinking. Thus, the universe, the various worlds and the objects therein, like stars, planets, mountains, rivers etc. and bodies and minds of human beings, plants, animals, insects, gods and asuras are all the manifestation of the combination of Existence-Consciousness, the real and nama roopa, the unreal.. All the time what we encounter is this combination of the real and the unreal; what we perceive is the unreal part; we do not perceive the real part. In our state of ignorance we take the unreal part to be real. What lends existence to the unreal nama roopa is the real, the Brahman. But for Brahman providing the sub-stratum of Existence, the nama roopa cannot appear. Conversely without nama roopa, there will be no world for us to experience. Brahman, the sub-stratum, being *avyavahaaryam* (not accessible to transaction), transaction requires nama roopa. A combination of existence and nama roopa is required for experience and transaction. But for this combination, there will be no samsara or atma vicara or liberation from samsara. Iswara visualizes and plans the creation, keeping in mind the requirements of the karmas of the jivas and impels Maya to unfold the nama roopa accordingly. Creation (*srshti*) is a cycle of projection and resolution of nama roopa. After the karma of the jivas pertaining to the janmas of jivas in a particular srshti is exhausted through enjoyment and suffering, Iswara makes Maya withdraw the projected nama roopa unto Himself in his aspect as Maya, there to remain, for a period, called "*pralaya*", in potential form, until karmas of jivas fructify for the next srshti. The *srshti*,

sthiti laya (creation, maintenance, resolution) cycle is without a beginning or end. The Advaita concept of creation is called "*vivarta vaada*" indicating that creation is not real. The perceived world is mithya. Maya is mithya. Iswara is mithya. Maya is *parinaami upaadaana kaaranam* (transforming material cause) and Iswara is *nimitta kaaranam* (intelligent cause). Brahman does not undergo change when creation takes place, Remaining as the all pervading Existence, Brahman, by Its mere presence, serves as the sub-stratum for the superimposition of nama roopa. And by its mere presence, it enables the antahkarana of living beings to acquire cidabhasa. When Sastra talks Brahman as the cause of the universe, we have to understand that Brahman's role in the manifestation of the world is confined to these two aspects.

Section 9 - The Concept of Maya

(Avidya, Prakriti, Pradhaana, Avyaktam, Avyaakrtam, Ajnaanam And Tamas Are Synonyms.)

24. Maya has two powers – *aavarana sakti* and *vikshepa sakti*. Through its avarana sakti Maya engenders jiva's ignorance of his true nature as Brahman. To distinguish this function of the avarana sakti, Maya is called "*moola avidya*". To denote the other function of the avarana sakti, obscuring the objects of the world, the word used is "*toola avidya*". Avidya (Maya) is a positive entity; a negative entity cannot have powers. Maya is matter, constituted of three factors, satva, rajas and tamas. Iswara, being the master of Maya, is not affected by the avarana sakti of Maya and is therefore ever aware of his true nature being Brahman. At the *vyashti* (microcosmic) level, in so far as jivas are concerned, both the avarana sakti and the vikshepa sakti of Maya come into play. The avarana sakti makes jivas ignorant of their true nature as Brahman and, as a consequence, *adhyaasa* is engendered. Adhyasa consists in our having the notion that nama roopa, the perceived objects outside and our own bodies and minds are real with that mistaken notion of reality, in our identifying ourselves with our body mind complex. Consequently, we regard ourselves as limited individuals, different from Brahman and other beings, transact with other beings and things and, in this process, take on ourselves the problems, the joy, suffering,

fear, sense of insecurity etc. belonging to the body and the mind . Identifying with the body mind complex which does action, thinks, enjoys and suffers and forgetting that we are the relationless (*asanga*) atma which is neither a doer nor enjoyer, we regard ourselves as the doer (karta) and the enjoyer (bhokta). Our transactions in the , with the sense of being the doer (*kartrtvam*), result in our incurring the liability to get rewards for good thoughts and deeds (called *punya*) and punishments for bad thoughts and deeds (called *papa*) and, we have to discharge the punya and papa debt in future births, in the form of enjoyment and suffering (*karmaphalam*). In the future births, we engage ourselves in further transactions and incur further punya and papa. Thus, we are caught up in the cycle of births and deaths and enjoyment and suffering. This is what is called samsara. Whereas, the macrocosmic cycle of creation (srishti), maintenance (*sthiti*) and resolution (*laya*) _is endless as well as beginningless, individual samsara is not endless. When we understand that we are not the body mind complex but we are the infinite Brahman, we get liberated from samsara.

1. Though avidya is the root cause of adhyasa, the primary link in the mechanism of adhyasa is ahamartha. There is mutual superimposition of ahamartha and atma. The consciousness of atma is superimposed on ahamartha and ahamartha assumes the status of a knower owing to the reflection of consciousness. Conversely, through the superimposition of ahamartha on atma, atma appears to be a localised I. Thus we say, “I know”. When atma is conditioned by ahamartha, we say,” I know”. With the addition of the mind to this mixture, we say, “I am happy”, “I am miserable” etc.. Withn the adiition of the body, we say “ I am a man”.” I am a father” etc. (Vide Sureswacarya in Naishkarmyasiddhi II.53 and Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya Vartikam II. 655).

Section 10 - The meaning of Liberation

25. Thus, the correct goal of human life, according to Advaita Vedanta is one's identification with Brahman, i.e., displacing the "I" from the body and ahamkara and fixing the "I" on Brahman, the existence-consciousness-infinity. Then, when I say "I", the "I" will no longer be the body and the ahamkara; it will be Brahman. This identification with Brahman is called "*aatma-jnaanam*" or "j*ivabrama-aikya-jnaanam*". Sentences in the sastra that reveal jivabrahmaikyam (the essential identity of jivatma and paramatma) are called *mahaavaakyas*. There are innumerable mahavakyas in the Upanishads. Four of them are famous, one in each Veda, namely, "*Tat tvam asi*" (Chandogya Upanishad – Sama Veda), "aham *brahma asmi*" (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad – Yajur Veda), "ayam *atma brahma*" (Mandukya Upanishad – Atharva Veda) and "prajnaanam *brahma*", (Aitereya Upanishad – Rg. Veda). Translated in English, the four mahavakyas are "Thou art That" "I am Brahman" "This atma is Brahman" and "Consciousness is Brahman").

26. In the process of the teaching, we also understand, as explained above, that the only reality is Brahman, the Existence and all else, i.e., the perceived world of objects and our own body mind complexes is mithya. This understanding, together with the understanding of "jivabrahmaikyam" is expressed by the famous sentence, "*Brahmasatyam jaganmithya, jivobrhmaiva naapara*." ("Brahman is the reality; the perceived world is mithya; jiva is Brahman, naught else.") .The moment this knowledge is gained effectively, one is liberated from the bondage of samsara in this very life. This liberation from the bondage of samsara, is called "*jivanmukti*". The one who has gained the knowledge in this very life, is called, "*jivanmukta*" or "*jnaani*".

27. It is not essential that one should renounce worldly life (become a *sanyaasi*) to gain the knowledge. If one can go through the practices (called *saadhanas*) prescribed for attaining mental purity, calmness and concentration of mind, which are prerequisites for gaining effective knowledge and devoting sufficient time regularly and systematically under the guidance of a competent teacher to the study of sastra, one can become a jnani even while one continues to be engaged in the duties of one's secular life.

Section 11 - The Significance of Liberation

1. The world perceived world does not disappear for a jnani. But his outlook and attitude to the perceived world become different. He has identified himself with non-dual reality, the infinite Brahman. Since he knows that the perceived world, including the body mind complex is mithya, he has no sorrow, no anxiety, no fear, no desire, no hatred, no worry and no sense of insecurity. In short, the jnani is not psychologically affected by anything, good or bad, happening in the world. In the dream I win a big prize in a raffle or I become a Bharat Ratna. But when I wake up, I am not elated. In the dream I have lost my only son. But when I wake up, I don't feel sad. The fire in the movie has burnt down the colony where I reside but when I wake up I am sitting comfortably in my house Similar is the psychological freedom of the jnani who is identified with the paramarthika satyam and is unaffected by the vyavharika satyam. This is the paramarthika drhshti.

28. The freedom from disturbance from the empirical world is a psychological freedom arising from the knowledge of the identification with the Infinite and does not extend to the physiological body. No doubt, the jnani has no sorrow, no anxiety, no fear, no worry, no craving, no attachment and no hatred. However, the body mind complex with which the person who has become a jnani is part of the vyavaharika world and as long as that body lives, there are duties pertaining to it. So, if the jnani is a householder, he does not cease to perform the duties and obligations towards the body, the family and the society. He does his duties with purpose but without any desire or anxiety and he accepts the results of actions, good or bad, favorable or unfavorable with spontaneous equanimity. . If the jnani is ill, he will also go to the doctor, but he will do so without any anxiety. If his wife is ill, the jnani will look after her with compassion but without sadness or anxiety or worry. If the jnani's son has to gain admission in a college, the jnani will also make efforts, but he will not do anything unrighteous for it nor will he be sad if he fails in his efforts. If his son obtains the first rank in his class, the jnani will also be happy, but he

will be equally happy if the son of a complete stranger, instead of his son, secures the first rank. Even while he is transacting with the perceived world, the deep undercurrent of thought that he is the Brahman that is beyond the vyavaharika perceived world will be there. The jnani is like the actor on the stage. Today, the actor plays the role of a beggar; tomorrow, he may play the role of a millionaire. But he knows that he is neither a beggar nor a millionaire. Like that, the jnani plays the role of father, husband, teacher and what not, committed but unattached and never without the undercurrent in the mind that he is really none of these but he is the relationless (asanga) Brahman. Or if we can imagine a person who is dreaming but is aware at that time itself that it is a dream and not real we can know the state of mind of the Jivanmukta This is the paramarthika drshti.. . If the jnani is a sanyasi, whatever work he undertakes, he will undertake, not for himself, but for the welfare of society or humanity or as an example for the common man. Sincerity and commitment will be there but, even here, there will be no psychological reaction to success or failure. His efforts for himself will be confined to the barest minimum requirements of sustenance and, if he is so inclined to teaching Vedanta or establishing institutions for such teaching.

29. The jnani is not dependent on anything except his identification with Brahman for peace of mind and happiness. This does not mean that he ceases to enjoy the good things of life, like good food or music or literature, but he does not have desire for them. That is to say, if it is there and he chooses to spare the time for it, he enjoys it, but if it is not there, he does not miss it. He may have taste, say, for music, but he has no need for it; he is happy with it or without. If he was a poet, he can continue to be a poet. If he was a musician, he can continue to be a musician. When he goes to a temple or church or mosque, he will also do worship but he will do so with the knowledge that he himself is Brahman and it is the vyavaharika body that is engaged in the worship. The long and short of it is that the "I" of the jnani is Brahman and whatever action is done (by way of duties or utilisation of talents or loka sangraha) is done with the sense that it is not he but one of the myriad body-mind complexes of the vyavaharika creation that is doing it.

The awareness, ahambrahmasmi, running as an undercurrent when the jnani's body is engaged in vyavahara is called '*sahaja samaadhi*'.

30. As a vyavaharika drshti, the jnani has the sense that he is all (*sarvaatmabhaava*."*)*. Sarvatmabhava is without prejudice to the knowledge, "Brahmasatyam jaganmithya" Whereas *asangatvam* (the sense that I am satyam Brahman, the world is mithya, the mithya world cannot affect me, is I paramarthika drshti, sarvatmabhava is a vyavaharika drshti; it is a positive perspective of the all pervading aspect of Brahman. The jnani can say, "The existence part of everything is Brahman and I am Brahman. In this sense everything is myself. Since all cidabhasas are reflections of me, the Brahma caitanyam, I can regard all vyavaharika glories and all vyavaharika happiness as my glory and happiness.' For the jnani, everything that there is, everybody's happiness is his happiness, everybody's knowledge is his knowledge and everybody's achievement is his achievement. This is not to be taken literally. It is only an intellectual attitude. Even a jnani can actually enjoy only whatever falls within the scope of the body and the antahkarana with which he was born. Regarding enjoyment of others, enjoyment as his is only an attitude born out of the knowledge that all nama roopa exist on Brahman. Having this attitude, the Jnani has no sense of lacking anything; and so, is free of desire and he has a sense of utter fulfillment (*poornatvam)* This is the meaning of Taittiriya Upanishad passage (2.1) where jnana phalam is mentioned – "He who knows Brahman as existing in the intellect which is lodged in the supreme space in the heart, enjoys simultaneously, in identification with the eternal Brahman (which is omniscient, all-pervasive and the atma of all), all the desirable things Similarly when the Upanishad, in Chandogya eighth chapter, sections 1 and 2, talks of freedom of movement in all the worlds and obtaining whatever he desires as objects of enjoyment, it is not actual movement by the body or actual enjoyment by the ahamkara, but an intellectual attitude born out of identification with the all pervasive Brahman which is the source of all ananda. ("*Yo veda nihitam guhaayaam parame vyoman; so asnute sarvaaan kaamaaan saha"*).

31. Sarvatma bhava can be not only this intellectual attitude of happiness and glory but freedom from hatred etc., since for the jnana, the atma of all the vyavaharika jivas are non-different from his own atma and the individual differences of characteristics are only on the mithya nama roopa level. Mithya should not to be taken seriously. This enables the jnani to have an attitude of compassion and freedom from negative reactions like hatred, jealousy, contempt etc. Isavasya Upanishad 6 – "He who sees all beings in the atma and the atma in all beings feels no hatred." ("*Yastu sarvaani bhootani atmani eva anupasyanti sarvabhooteshu ca aatmaanam tato na vijugupsate*"). 'Seeing all beings in the atma' refers to the nama roopa and 'seeing atma in all beings 'refers to the adhishtanam, Brahman. With this vision, a jnani loves all equally and he has no jealousy or hatred towards anybody.
32. Thus, *jnana phalam*, the benefit of the recognition of jivabrahmaikyam, is twofold - (i) sarvatmabhava and poornatvam (from the standpoint of the vyavaharika plane (2) *asangatvam* (from the standpoint of the paramarthika plane), dismissing the nama roopa as unreal, the sense that I. the paramarthika alone am , infinite in terms of space, time and entity and nothing on the vyaharika plane can affect me The jnani thus has the choice of ananda arising out of the attitude, " I am everything" or the peace of being relationless (asanga) Brahman. the knowledge that I alone am, all else is mithya and nothing can affect me, the satyam." "*Sarvatmabhava*" (the sense that I am all) is without prejudice to the knowledge, "Brahmasatyam jaganmithya" Whereas *asangatvam* (the sense that I am satyam Brahman, the world is mithya; the mithya world cannot affect me is paramarthika drshti, sarvatmabhava is a vyavaharika drshti; it is a positive perspective of the all pervading aspect of Brahman.

2. A question that arises in the context of sarvatmabhava is that if a jnani can, intellectually claim all happiness to be his happiness, why doesn't he, intellectually, claim all sorrow to be his sorrow. The answer is that happiness is related to a sense of poornatvam and being identified with Satya Brahman, the poornam (infinite), claiming happiness is all right. But sorrow is a result of a sense of limitation arising from

ignorance of brahmatvam which is caused by the avarana sakti of Maya. He is free of the avarana sakti of Maya and therefore he cannot claim sorrow. (If sorrow were to belong really to atma, you can never negate sorrow.) Brhadaranyaka 1.5.20 which talks of an upasaka who imagines he to be the atma of all says that he is not affected by the sorrow of others.

33. Since the jnani has disidentified with the body mind complex with which he was born, he becomes free of the sancita karma pertaining to that body mind complex and there is no rebirth for the sukshma sarira with which he was born. Action involves physical and mental movement. Movement is change in space and time. Thought is also a movement, being a modification of the mind. Brahman being all pervading, formless, attributeless (i.e., without any attributes) and changeless is not karta (doer) or bhokta (enjoyer). Since the Jnani is identified with Brahman, he is free from the sense of doership and enjoyership, (i.e., free from the sense of engaging in action and experiencing objects) (free from *kartrtvam* and *bhoktrtvam*). Cf. Kathopanishad I.2.xix – "He who thinks that he is the killer or the killed does not know atma. Atma neither kills nor is killed." Action and thought done or entertained with kartrtvam and bhoktrtvam alone results in the accumulation of punya and papa. So, for the jnani, no agami karma accrues once he gains jnanam. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.xxiv.3 – "Papa does not trouble him by producing the desired result or generating sin, but, he, the knower of Brahman consumes all papa, i.e., burns it to ashes with the fire of the realization of the Self of all." However, as indicated by Chandogya Upanishad mantra VI.xiv.2 – "….for the man of knowledge, the delay is for so long (as long as he does not become freed of the bodies and merges in Existence", the prarabdha karma gets exhausted only by through enjoyment, just as an arrow that has gathered momentum after being shot toward a target stops only with the exhaustion of its momentum. But even here, there is a difference. While the physical aspect cannot be avoided, on the psychological plane, the jnani is not disturbed. If something good happens he does not gloat. If something bad happens, he is not depressed. He takes everything that happens on the physical

plane as the prarabdha pertaining to the body-mind complex with which he has already dissociated himself and therefore there is no disturbance in his mind. The state in which Jnani continues to live, disidentfied with the body and ahamkara, is compared to the snake sloughing off its old skin.

Section 12 – Knowledge: The Sole Means of Liberation

Liberation is possible in this life itself. One Who Is So Liberated, Called Jiivanmukta, Attains Videhamukti When The Body Falls.

34. According to Advaita Vedanta, liberation from samsara, which is called *moksha* or *mukti*, is obtained only through knowledge of identity with Brahman and not through any karma or upasana.

35. Liberation is not a new state or an event. Being the infinite Brahman is our eternal nature. The notion of being separate limited individuals subject to the bondage of samsara is only ignorance in the mind. The moment one gains the knowledge, "I am Brahman", one discovers one's true eternal nature. The event that happens is only destruction of the ignorance in the mind. Liberation is only owning up one's true nature. Cf. Sankaracarya's Brahmasutra Bhashyam – "…..for as Brahman constitutes a person's Self, It is not something to be attained by that person." Moksha can be attained be a person in the current life itself. The one who has got moksha in the current life itself is called. *Jiivanmukta*. Jivanmukti is like discovering a diamond one had misplaced and thought that he had lost it.

36. In the case of ordinary people, i.e., those who have not identified themselves with the Infinite Brahman (called *ajnaanis*), at the time of death, the sukshma sarira and karana sarira, along with cidabhasa, *vasanas*, i.e., habit-forming impressions of experiences of thoughts and actions stored in the mind) and the karma (the sancita karma) leave the sthoola sarira and enter another sthoola sarira in another world or in this world. But when the sthoola sarira of a jnani

falls, the sthoola sarira decomposes and merges in the *pancabhootas*, (akasa, air, fire, water and earth), the sukshma sarira disintegrates, is dis-individualised and merges in samashti sukshma sarira and the individualized karana sarira gets dis-individualised and merges in Maya. Since the ahamkara disintegrates, the sancita karma pertaining to that ahamkara is destroyed and the Jiivanmukta 'becomes Brahman'. This is called *videhamukti*.' 'Becomes Brahman' or 'Merges in Brahman' does not mean any event or transformation. The original consciousness has ever been Brahman. As regards the death of the sthoola sarira and the disintegration of the sukshma sarira, the jivanmukta has already disowned them. For him, it is just one of the myriad bodies superimposed on Brahman. The death and disintegration are of no particular or concern to him. It is an incident only from the point of other jivas only. As Sankaracarya clarifies in his bhashyam on Brahma sutra 4, a jnani is *asariiram* not after death, but in this life itself. Thus, really speaking, there is no further mukti when videhamukti takes place. For Brahman, there is nothing like superimpositions or their removal. The one who has attained videhamukti is actually the Infinite Brahman Itself. Moksha is a term applicable both to jivanmukti and videhamukti.

Section 13 - Kramamukti

Sastra also talks of a more difficult route of attaining liberation through knowledge. If one has done certain types of *sakaama upaasana* (upasana with desire for benefits other than spiritual benefits) - in addition to rites, in one's life but has not attained the doubt-free and abiding knowledge that he is Brahman (ahambrhmasmi jnanam) goes to the world of Hiranyagarbha (*Brahmaa*). There he has the opportunity to learn Vedanta from Brahmaa himself as the teacher. If he utilizes that opportunity, he becomes a jivanmukta in Brahmaa's world. At the end of that Brahmaa's life, he also attains videhamukti along with that Brahmaa. This is called "*kramamukti*". (The word, "Brahmaa" should not be confused with Brahman. Brahmaa is an aspect of Iswara, personified as a God, involved in the process of creation and dissolution). Called, also, Hiranyagarbha, He is subordinate to Iswara. From another angle Iswara is the

macrocosmic causal body (*samashti kaarana sariiira* which is the same as Maya*)* and Hiranyagarbha is the macrocosmic subtle body (*samashti sukshma sariira*) and *Viraat* is the macrocosmic physical body (*samashti sthoola sariira*); in all of them Brahma caitanyam is reflected. The types of Upasana required to be done for going to the Hiranyagarbha loka include upasana on Omkara as Brahman or on *Hiranyagarbha,* upasana of Iswara, as Iswara with various attributes, or upasana of any other deity as a representative of Iswara, imagining that deity to be himself (*ahamgraha upaasana*) upasana on the five fires (*pancaagni upasana*) (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad sixth chapter, second Brahmana, upasana on Gayatri mantra (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad fifth chapter, fourteenth Brahmana). Cf. Chandogya Upanishad 1.4.5, 1.9.2, 3.14.2, 3.14.4, 4.15.5,5.10.10, 5.13.24, 5.18.1; Brhadaranyaka 1.5.20, 5.6.1, 5.7.1, 5.13.4, 5.14.8, 6.2.15, 6.3.6).

TOPIC 3: PHILOSOPHY OF ADVAITA VEDANTA AS EXPOUNDED IN THE UPANISHADS

Section 1 - Preparatory Spiritual Practices

37. The Karma kanda practices (*saadhanas*) are a prelude to the pursuit of jnana kanda. The human tendency to seek happiness in material acquisitions and achievements and the dawning of the wisdom that one must find happiness within oneself by recognizing one's true nature as the infinite Brahman are brought out in *Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, Mundaka Upanishad* and *Katopanishad*. *Brahadaranyaka Upanishad* IV.iv.22 – " The Braahmana, seeking to know It (Brahman) (purify their minds) through the chanting of Vedas, (and, later), performance of sacrifices and duties (of the chosen avocation), and charity, (leading) an austere and dispassionate life and thereby developing a desire to know Brahman, become sages and (thereafter,) renouncing worldly life altogether, become monks (*sanyasis*) (to engage in enquiry into the Self – *atma vicaara*)." Mundaka Upanishad I.ii.12 – " Having understood by experience and inference the troubles and impermanence of worldly life and impermanence of the effects of all karma and thus developing dispassion towards the worldly life, desiring to know the eternal Reality, to pursue enquiry into atma (Brahman), a Brahmana should take to renunciation (*sanyaasa*) and go with sacrificial faggot in hand (symbolic of respect , faith and devotion) to a traditional teacher who is well versed in the Vedas and is abiding in Brahman ("*stotriya brahmanishtha*") . ("The word, "Brahmana" in these Upanishads refers, not to Brahamna by birth but to the seeker engaged in the practice of karma yoga, as a preparatory step to the pursuit of jnana yoga and to the seeker engaged in jnana yoga.) Jabala Upanishad IV.1 (Janaka is the student, Yajnavalkya is the teacher) – " After completing the period of disciplined studentship (brahmacarya) one may become a householder (grahastha). After being a

householder one may become a forest-dweller (vanaprastha). Having become a vanaprastha one may renounce the world (and thus become a sanyasi). Or, alternatively, one may embrace sanyasa from brahmacarya itself or from the stage of a householder….(it can also be that) a person may renounce worldly life that very day on which distaste for it dawns on him…..” Kathopanishad Mantra II.i.1 & 2 - “The self-evident Lord has endowed the mind and the sense organs with outward-going capacity. Therefore people tend to perceive only external objects and not the atma within. But a rare wise man, seeking liberation from births and deaths and turning the vision inwards sees (i.e. after study, recognises) the pratyagatma (the Brahma caitanyam available in the individual).” “The foolish ones wallow in external objects and are caught in the bondage of mortality (i.e., the cycle or birth and death and suffering and sorrow). Whereas the wise ones, with discrimination, having learnt that the goal is immortality (i.e. liberation from the cycle of births and deaths) give up the desire for the impermanent objects of the perceived world.”

38. This does not mean that one should give up one’s occupation or cease to earn. On the other hand, except in respect of persons who have renounced the worldly life, family and possessions and have formally adopted a life style devoted exclusively to Jnana Yoga, called, *vividisha sannyaasa*, Sastra enjoins on all such persons the duty of fulfilling the obligations pertaining to one’s station in life – obligations not only to one’s own family, but to society, ancestors, teachers, mankind as a whole, and environment (plant and animal kingdom and the insentient objects of the world) so as to contribute to ecological and cosmic harmony (*panca-mahaa-yagna*) as well as the obligation to oneself to obtain facilities for one’s own spiritual progress. For a spiritually inclined person, even while continuing to live a worldly life, there should be no omission of duties and obligations covered by panca maha yajna or deviation from righteousness or deviation from satyam (truthfulness), ahimsa (non-violence (exceptions will be for the defense of the nation, et.) If there is surplus wealth, it should be devoted to the welfare of the needy. This is generally referred to a life of adherence to *dharma*. Kathopanishad I.ii.24 emphasizes that, unless one desists from bad conduct and keeps his senses under control and mind concentrated

and free from anxiety, he cannot attain Brahman by gaining knowledge of identification with Brahman (*na aviratah duscaritaat na asaantah na asamaahitah na asaantamanasah va api prajnaanena enam aapnuyaat*).

39. The qualification to be acquired for studying Jnana kanda is called "*sadhana catushtayam*" – which consists of (a) discrimination between the eternal and the ephemeral (*atma anaatma viveka*), (b) absence of desire for the enjoyment of the (fruits of one's actions) in this world, as also in the other world; in other words, non-attachment to enjoyment of objects both here and hereafter (*vairagya*) (c) six –fold discipline (*shadka sampatti*) consisting of (i) control of or mastery over the mind (*sama*), control of the external sense organs (*dama*), (iii) strict adherence to one's duties and obligations, called dharma (*uparati*), endurance of heat and cold, pleasure and pain, tolerance of all discomfort (*titiksha*), (iv) faith in sastra and *guru* (teacher) (*sraddha*), and of mind – *citta-aikaagrataa* and calmness of mind (*citta naischalyam*(called *samadhana*m and (d) intense yearning for liberation for liberation (*mumukshutvam*) . The means for acquiring this sampatti consists of karma yoga and upasana. Though the chances of benefiting from the pursuit of jnana kanda are greater, if one takes to that pursuit after acquiring sadhana catushtaya sampatti, one who has not yet acquired it is not precluded from pursuit of jnana kanda for lack of it. One can practice the elements of sadahana catushtaya samaptti and the pursuit of jnana kanda simultaneously.

   The components of sadhana catushtaya samaptti are mentioned in Brahadaranyaka (kanva sakha) IV.iv.23 as the features of a jnani, which are the same as qualifications of an aspirant) and what is not mentioned there, viz., sraddha, is mentioned in the madhyantina sakha.

Section 2 - Enquiry Into One's Real Nature

Introduction

The core of the teaching in Advaita Vedanta is the identity of Jivatma and Paramatma. For knowledge of Paramatma, we have to rely entirely on Sastra. But the real nature of Jivatma, that is, our own real nature, can be known by inward enquiry. It is called *tvampada-vicaara*. There are variations of tvampada-vicara. These ar*e drgdrsyaviveka, pancakosaviveka, avasthaatrayavivieka* and analysis of stages of life. Jivatma is a mixture of pratyagatma, the sukshma sarira and sthoola sarira. When the unenlightened man refers to himself as "I", he is referring to the sthoola-sukshma-sarira complex (what we generally refer to as the body-mind-complex). He is not aware of the pratyagatma, which is the same as Brahman, the pure, infinite consciousness. The identification with Brahman which Sastra shows as the only means of liberation from samsara is not possible unless we recognize pratyagatma as our real nature, and learning from Sastra that pratyagatma is not different from Brahma caitanyam, identify ourself with Brahman.. We have no preconceived notion about Brahman; so, we readily accept what sastra says about Brahman. But about ourselves, in successive janmas, we have been regarding ourselves as the limited personalities based on the body mind complex and so, when Sastra tells us that we are the pure consciousness identical with the infinite Brahman, we do not readily accept it. That is why enquiry into one's own real nature (*tvam-pad-vicaara*) is more important than enquiry into the nature of Brahman (*tat--pada-vicaara*).

Subsection1 : Drgdsyaviveka

(The term, "drgdrsyaviveka" refers to the general thesis that whatever is known is *anaatma* (not-atma) and that the ultimate seer is atma. Here we are applying it to atma as the witness of the mind itself. We do not find many passages in the Upanishads on this subject. Two prakarana granthas have been cited in this section).

Brhadaranyaka III.4.2 talks of atma as the Seer of the Seer, Hearer of the hearer, Thinker of the thinker, Knower of the knower. Kenopanishad talks of Brahman being known with each

cognition, i.e., as Sankaracarya explains, as the witness of cognitions. Part I of Sankaracarya's Atmajnanopadesavidhih is a step by step presentation of drgdrsyaviveka as applied to atma as the witness of the mind. Verse 2 – "That the seen is different from the seer, the atma, is well known to all. Now, the question is asked, 'what the atma is?'". Verses 3 to 6 establish that the body is not atma, since the body is perceived as 'this' (i.e., as an object) and also because when consciousness leaves the body, the body becomes inert like wood et, when fire leave them. Verses 7,8 and 9 exclude the sense organs because they are merely instruments of perception. Verses 10 and 11 say that the mind and the intellect are not atma because they are objects of Consciousness and are also instruments of perception. Verses 22 to 24 say that the ego (*ahamatha)* is not the atma, either, because it is also an object of perception, like jars and other things, is absent in sushupti and is endowed with various qualities like pain, pleasure and so on and possesses mundane qualities (such as aversion, desire etc.). Part II verse 1 – "What, then is the atma? It is distinct from all the things mentioned before and is the innermost, all-pervading like space, subtle, eternal, without any parts, without attributes, unblemished, having no activities like going and coming, devoid of the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' and also devoid of desire, aversion and effort, self-effulgent by nature, like the heat of the fire or like the light of the sun, having no connection with the elements such as space etc, possessing no organs like the intellect etc., free from the gunas of satva etc., not having the prana and other vital airs, untouched by hunger, thirst, grief ,delusion, old age and death; it is the atma which resides in the hearts of all beings and is the seer of all the intellects. In verses 3 to 7, the objection is raised," Since the agency of the action of seeing is what is called 'seeing', how can the atma which is devoid of the idea of 'me' and 'mine' and of desire, aversion and effort, be called a 'seer. Further, , unlike the intellect which undergoes modifications and knows a limited number of objects, one after another, the atma is devoid of change and does not depend on instruments etc; how can such an atma be a 'seer' in the sense of knowing a limited number of objects, one after another.". The answer is given in verses10 and 12. "……There is a

relation of superimposition between the atma and the intellect, which, though of a non-effulgent nature, like a crystal, appears to be effulgent owing only to the proximity of an effulgence, namely, the atma which is purely of an effulgent nature." "And it is only in relation to other things that the atma is called a knower. The sun may be taken as an example. Though entirely devoid of the ideas of 'me' and 'mine' and also of desire and effort, atma is called an illuminator in relation to things illumined owing only to its proximity to them, being just light devoid of all change (*prakaasatvam prakaasa-swaroopa-sannidhi-matrena prakaasena avikriyamaanena*). It is an illuminator in no other way. It is the ignorant that superimpose the agency of the action of illumining things on the sun when things are illumined by the sun. Similarly, the agency of the quality of a seer (action of knowing objects – *drsyatvam*) is superimposed, in relation to the manifestation of things like the intellect and other things, on the atma which is of the nature of pure Consciousness (*aatnamah drk-roopasya*) devoid of all change as well as free from attributes (*sarva-vikriyaa-viseshana-rahitasya)* and is the witness of all intellects and their modifications (*sarva-pratyaya-saakshinah*). Atma does nothing but stand in the proximity to the objects of knowledge, as Consciousness, not different from Itself (*drsya-sannidhi-matrena caitanya-swaroopena ayatiriktena)*. It cannot be a seer (knower) in no other way (*anyathaa-drshtatva-aabhaavaatii)*. In verse 14, there is a comparison of the loadstone moving iron only by its proximity. The idea is given in a nutshell in Drgdrsyaviveka verse 1– "Colors (*roopam*) are perceived by the eye and the eye is their perceiver. It (the eye) is perceived and the mid is its perceiver. The mind with its modifications is perceived and the Witness *(*sakshi, i.e., the atma) is verily the perceiver. But it (the sakshi) is not perceived by any other. (*roopam drsyam locanam drk tat-drsyam drktu maanasam; drsyaa dhii-vrittaya-saaakshii drgeva na drsyate*). Details follow. Verse 2 – "The forms appear on account of various distinctions such as blue, yellow, gross, subtle, short, long etc. The eye, on the other hand, sees them, itself remaining one and the same." Verse 3 – 'Characteristics of the eye such as blindness, sharpness or dullness, the

mind cognizes; the mind also cognizes characteristics of the ear, skin etc." Verse 4 – " Consciousness (*citih)* illumines desire, determination and doubt, belief and non-belief, constancy and its opposite, understanding, fear and others, because Consciousness is a unity (*ekadaa*). Verse 6 – " *Buddhi* appears to possess luminosity on account of the reflection of Consciousness in it. Buddhi is of two kinds – egoity (*ahamkrti*) and the internal organ (antahkarana).

Verse 12 – "Give up the misconception of the identification with the body etc and know yourself to be Existence-Consciousness-Bliss, the witness of the intellect (*dhii-saaksi*). How the apramata atma can be said to be a 'witness' has been explained in the main text (Section1.).

Subsection2 : Pancakosavivieka

This is discussed in Taittiriya Upanishad Brahmanandavalli. . It talks of "*annamaya kosa*" corresponding to the sthoola sarira, "*praanamaya kosa*" corresponding to that part of the sukshma sarira which consists of the five vital airs – prana, apana, vyana, udana, and samana and the five organs of action (*karmendriyas*), "*manomaya kosa"* corresponding to that part of the sukshma sarira which consists of the mind, i.e.,. the cognizing faculty, which is also the generator of emotions and shares the five organs of perception (jananendriyas),. "*vijanamaya kosa*" corresponding to that part of the sukshma sarira which consists of the intellect,, i.e., the deciding faculty, which shares the jnaanendriyas and which includes the ego (the *ahamartha*) and "*anandamaya kosa*" corresponding to the *karana sarira* of the seep sleep state in which a person experiences ignorance and bliss. The kosas are introduced one after the other as atma. First, the Upanishad describes the annamaya kosa and says it is atma. Then, saying that there is something interior and subtler than that, namely pranamaya kosa, negates the annamaya kosa (that is, dismisses it, saying that it is not atma – it is *anatma*) and so on, until it negates even anandamaya,

describing its parts as "*priya*", *moda*" and "*promoda*" which are grades of experiential happiness and, finally, reveals the ultimate conscious principle and avers that that is atma, Brahman.

Subsection3 : Avasthatrayavivieka

1. Another way of analysis is to examine the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep called, respectively, "*jaagrat avastha*", "*swapna avastha*" and "*sushupti avastha*". This is discussed in Mandukya Upanishad which has to be studied with Mandukya Karika which is supposed to be a commentary on the Upanishads but is, in itself, an elaborate prakarana grantha. From the Upanishad, itself, we can derive the existence of a changeless consciousness, apart from the changing mind. In Mantra 2, the Upanishad declares the identity of atma and Brahman in the following terms. :- "Ayam atma Brahma". Thereafter it describes the experiencer of the waking state (jagrat avastha), called *Vaisvaanara*, the experiencer of the dream state (swapna avastha), called *taijasa* and the experiencer of the deep sleep state (sushupti avastha), called *praajna*. In the crucial mantra 7, it defines atma as that which is neither conscious of the internal perceived world nor conscious of the external perceived world, which is not even a mass of consciousness or simple consciousness. (*Na antah prajnam, na bahih prajnam, na prajnaanaghana, na prajnam*). Thus it rules out atma being the ahamkara operating in the jagrat avastha and the swapna avastha and lying dormant in the sushupti avastha. By saying that it is not simple consciousness, it rules out a consciousness which is aware of everything simultaneously. That is to say atma is not a knower-consciousness in any sense.. And it hastens to add that atma is not unconsciousness (*na aprajnam*). Thereafter it describes atma as being beyond empirical dealings (*avyavahaaryam)*. This word clearly distinguishes atma from any consciousness which functions as the knower (pramaata) or doer (karta) or enjoyer (bhokta); thus this word serves to differentiate the changing ahamkara from the changeless atma. The other words occurring in the mantra also differentiate the changeless pure, superior consciousness that is atma from the changing ahamkara which is involved in perceived worldly transactions as the pramaata, karta

and bhokta. These are *adrshtam* (unperceived)…., *prancopasmamam* (in which all phenomena cease), *saantam* (unchanging), *sivam* (auspicious) and *advaitam* (free from ideas of difference or undifferentiated). That the changeless consciousness continues as the constant conscious entity behind the changing knower –consciousness in the states of waking etc. is indicted by the words "*eka-atma-pratyaya-saaram*".

2. In jagrat avastha, my body, my sense organs and my ahamkara are all fully active and I am perceiving external objects and transacting with an external world (persons and things outside me). In swapna avastha, my body and my sense organs are dormant and my ahamkara projects a dream world. During sushupti, both the body and ahamkara are dormant. The ahamkara operating in the jagrat avastha, called *visva*), is not there when the ahamkara operating in the swapna avastha, called *taijasa*, has come; neither the *visva* nor the *taijasa* is there when the ahamkara is dormant, as *praajna*, in the sushupti avastha.. Neither the taijasa nor the praajna is there when the visva has come again. But still, I regard myself as the same conscious being. In doing so, I am invoking a constant conscious entity that was there when the visva was transacting with the perceived world, that was there when the taijasa was dreaming, that was there when the prajna was sleeping and that is there when the visva has come again. This constant consciousness is the atma, the real I.
3. In this connection we can refer to the following passage in "Upadesa Sahasri" of Sankaracarya: - The disciple is asking "But at no time Your Holiness, have I ever seen pure consciousness or anything else". The teacher answers, "Then you are seeing in the state of deep sleep; for you deny only the seen object, not the seeing. I said that your seeing is pure consciousness. That (eternally) existing one by which you deny (the existence of the seen object) when you say that nothing has been seen, (that precisely) is the seeing, that is pure consciousness. Thus as (It) does not depart (from you) (Its) transcendental changelessness and eternity are established solely by Itself without depending upon any means of knowledge." The pupil said, "….And there is no apprehender different from this apprehender to apprehend it."

4. That consciousness continues even during sushupti when all instruments of knowledge including the ahamkara are dormant is expressed poetically in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.23 to 30 – “ That It does not see, smell, taste, speak, hear, think. touch, or know is because although seeing, smelling, tasting, speaking, hearing, thinking, touching and knowing then, it des not see, smell, taste, speak, hear, think, touch, know; for the vision of the witness can never be lost, because it is imperishable.” Sankaracarya’s commentary – “The vision of the witness is possible like the sun, etc, revealing things. Just as the sun and the like are naturally ever-luminous and reveal things through their constant light; .so is the atma called a witness on account of its imperishable eternal vision. Just as the sun and the luminaries reveal things through their constant, natural light, and not through one produced for the time being (so is the atma a witness through its eternal, natural consciousness) and that is its function as a witness in the primary sense, for there cannot be any other witness besides it:

   Objection: This is contradicted by our experience that we sometimes see and sometimes do not see.

   Reply: This is simply due to the particular activities of our organs…….Therefore the vision of the atma is imperishable, and through that imperishable, self-luminous vision the atma continues to see in the state of deep sleep. How is it, then, (it is said) that it does not see ……Those things that caused the particular visions (of the waking and dream states) viz. the mind, the eyes and forms were all presented by avidya as something different from the atma. They are n unified in the state of deep sleep, as the jivatma has been embraced by Paramatma. Only when the atma is under limitations, do the organs stand as something different to help it t particular experiences. But it is now embraced by its own paramatma, which is pure consciousness and the atma of all….Hence the organs and objects do not stand as different entities; and since they are absent, there is no particular experience, for this is the product of the organs etc., not of the atma, and

only appears as the product of the atma. Therefore it is an erroneous notion produced by this (absence of particular experience) that the vision f the atma is lost.

5. In short, the reference is to the continued presence of the atma caitanyam consciousness as the witness of the non-functioning mind, even when ahamkara is dormant and there is no experience of an external world of objects or an internal dream world. It is only when the sense organs and ahamkara are functioning that one perceives an external world of objects and it is only when the ahamkara is active, even though the sense organs are dormant, that one sees a dream). The atma caitanyam is eternal – there is no interruption in Its presence behind the ahamkara, whether the ahamkara is active or dormant.

Section 3 - Orders of Reality

1. Advaita Vedanta does not deny the experiential or empirical reality ('*vyavaharika satyatvam*') of the perceived world. The seeming contradictions in Upanishad statements can only be reconciled on the basis of the Advaita Vedanta doctrine of different orders of reality. The concept of different orders of reality is available in Chandogya Upanishad - vide II.vi.1– "That (Brahman) created all that exists. That (Brahman), having created that entered into that very thing. And, having entered there, It became the true and the untrue, Truth became all this. ("*satyam ca anrutam ca; satyam abhavat*"). Sankaracarya explains, "It follows from the context that *satyam* is truth falling within the range of the empirical, and not absolute truth. For the absolute truth is only one, which is Brahman. But here the relative truth, as found in the empirical (perceived world) is referred to; as for instance, water is said to be true in comparison with the water in a mirage which is false. Untruth is the opposite of that. Again, what is that became all this? That which is the absolute truth. What is that, again? It is Brahman; for it is Brahman that has been introduced as the topic of discussion by the sentence 'Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinitude.' Thus, the word, "true" "t" in small case has been interpreted as vyaavahaarika satyam, the word "untrue" as pratibhasika satyam and the word "True" with capital "T" as paaramaartika satyam. This is the authority ("*pramaana*") for three orders of

reality, in the descending order - absolute reality (paramartika satyam*),* empirical reality (vyavaharika satyam*)* and subjective reality (pratibhasika satyam).

Section 4 - Description of Brahman, The Absolute Reality

1. The Taittiriya mantra 2.1.1 – "satyam jnanam anantam brahma" reveals the nature of Brahman in a nutshell. The following is a paraphrase of extracts from Sankaracarya's commentary:-

   (a)Sankaracarya first clarifies that the sentence, "satyam, jnanam, anantam brahma" is a definition of Brahman (*brahmanah lakshanaartah vakyam).* The three words, satyam, jnanam, anantam are not adjectives (not *visheshaani).* A noun can be distinguished only when there is the possibility of its ruling out some other adjective that does not belong to it), as for instance a blue or red lotus. An adjective is meaningful when there are many nouns which belong to the same class and which are capable of having many adjectives; but it can have no meaning with regard to a single noun, where there is no possibility of any alternative adjective. There is a single Brahman, just as there is a single sun; there do not exist other Brahmans from which It can be distinguished, unlike a blue lotus that can be (marked out from a red one) Definition marks out an entity from everything else (*sarvata eva nivartakaani).*

   (b)Taking the words of the definition, Sankaracarya says, that that which does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own is satyam……So, the word, 'satyam' distinguishes Brahman from mutable things. …To indicate that It is not insentient like earth, the word 'jnanam' is juxtaposed. The word, 'jnanam' means consciousness. Juxtaposed with the words, 'satyam' and 'anantam', it negates the idea of the agent of knowing. If Brahman be the agent of knowing, satyam and anantam cannot be part of the definition. If It is the agent of knowing, It becomes changeful and so cannot be satyam. That indeed is infinite which is not limited by anything. (cf. another Vedic text, 'The Infinite is that where one does not know anything else'. If it is the agent of knowing, it becomes delimited by the knowable and the knowledge, and hence

there cannot be infinitude (anantam). …Besides, if It has such distinctive attributes as becoming the agent of knowing, It cannot logically be pure existence. In the 6th Chapter of Chandogya Upanishads starting with 'O, good looking one, in the beginning this was existence alone' 6.8.7 says, 'That which is this subtle essence, all this has got That as the atma. That is satyam…' Thus the words, 'satyam' and 'sat' are equated, Therefore the word, 'jnanam' (knowledge) having been used… along with 'satyam' and 'anantam', is derived in the cognate sense of the verb, and it is used to form the phrase 'jnanam brahma' (Brahman is knowledge) to rule out any relationship between noun and verb as that of an agent etc. as also for denying non-consciousness like that of earth, etc. From the phrase, 'jnanam brahma' there is possibility of thinking that Brahman is limited, because human knowledge is limited. To obviate this, the text says, 'anantam' ('infinite').

(c) Explaining the word, "infinitude" Sankaracarya says that it has been said at the beginning of the mantra that Brahman is satyam, jnanam and anantam. ……As to that, there are three kinds of infinitude (*aanantyam*) – space-wise, time-wise and entity-wise. To illustrate, the sky is unlimited from the point of view of space, for it is not limited in space. But the sky is not infinite as regards time or entity. Why"? Because it is a product. Brahman is thus not limited in time like the sky, since It is not a product. A created thing is circumscribed by time, but Brahman is not created. Therefore It is infinite from the point of view of time as well. Similarly, It is infinite from the point of view of entity, because It is non-different from everything else. A thing that is different acts as a limitation to another. For example, the idea of horsehood excludes the idea of cowhood and the idea of cowhood becomes delimited. Such limitation is seen in the case of distinct objects. Brahman is not differentiated in this way. Therefore it has infinitude from the point of view of substances. How is Brahman non-different from everything? Because it is the cause of everything. Wouldn't Brahman be limited by Its own effects? No, since the objects that are effects are unreal.`….Existence (i.e., Brahman as sub-stratum of everything) alone is true .(Chandogya 6.1.4 and 6.2.1)….. Brahman then is spatially infinite, being the cause of space etc.

…Indeed, no all pervading thing is seen in this world to originate from anything that is not so. Therefore, the spatial infinitude of Brahman is absolute. Temporally, Brahman's infinitue is abslute since Brahman is not a product. And because there is nothing different from Brahman, Brahman is infinite in terms entity as well. Thus the reality of Brahman is absolute.

In his commentary on the Chandogya mantra 6.2.1, "sat *eva soumya idam agra aaseet ekam eva advidiiyam…*" Sankaracarya explains, "The word '*sat*' means mere Existence, a thing that is subtle, without distinction, all pervasive, one, taintless, partless, consciousness, which is known from all the Upanishads. The word '*eva*' is used for emphasis. (*Sadeva – sat iti astitvamaatram vastu nirvisesham sarvvagatam, ekam, niranjanam, niravayavam, vijnaaanam yat aagamyate sarvavedantebhyah. Ekasabdah avataaranaarthah*.) Before creation, it was not possible to grasp it as possessed of name and form. ….By the words, 'One only', is meant that there was nothing else coming under the category of its product. 'Without a second' means that It (Existence) has no second thing different from Itself".

Readers may notice a discrepancy from the outline of the philosophy in the main paper, when it is said, here, that Brahman is the cause of creation and that Brahman is non-different from everything. Elsewhere, Sankaracarya himself will make it clear that creation does not proceed from nirguna Brahman, but from a Brahman associated with Maya. And when Sankaracarya talks of unity and says that Brahman is non-different from everything, what he means, as far as the writer can make out, is that the one Brahman alone, as the sub-stratum, lends existence to everything and the superimposed nama roopa being mithya, Brahman is the sole reality and there is no other real entity to delimit Brahman. "There is no world other than Brahman" is like saying that there is no pot other than clay.

2. Other passages in the Upanishads revealing the *swaroopam* of Brahman (I. e the nature of Brahman) are cited below ("Brahman" and "Atma" are interchangeable words) That Brahman is non-dual (*advayam, advaitam, advidtiiyam)* is stated in Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.1 and 6.2.2,

in Kaivalya Upanishad 19 and 23, Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.22, Mandukya Upanishad 7, Nrsimhaottaratapaniya Upanishad 8 and 9, Ramopoorvatapaniya Upanishad 5, and Muktikopanishad 2.73. The Chandogya mantra 6.2.1, "*Ekam eva advidiiyam*" negates *swagata bheda* (internal difference as in an entity having parts, by the word, 'ekam', *swajatiiya bheda* (difference between members of the same species) by the word, 'eva' and *vijatiiya bheda* (difference between one species and another) by the word 'advidiiyam' This is an elaboration of the non-duality of Brahman, establishing the unique status of Brahman as the only reality.. That Brahman is infinite (anantam), we can see in Taittiriya Upanishad 2.1., - "Satyam, janma, anantam Brahma" and in Swesvatara Upanishad 1.9 – "Anantah ca atma visvaroopah…" In Mandukya Upanishad mantra 7, it is said- "It is not the inward awareness. It is not the outward awareness. It is not the intermediate awareness. It is not the undifferentiated mass of awareness. It is not the knowing awareness. It is not non-awareness. It is unperceivable. It is not accessible to transaction. It cannot be grasped. It is attributeless. It is not accessible to thought. It is not amenable to communication. It is the constant atma that subsists in all the changing states of the ahamkara.. It is the remainder of the annulment of the perceived universe. It is changeless. It is auspiciousness. It is the non-dual reality free of all mithya ideas of difference. ……That is atma tat is to be known. (*Na antah-prajnam, na bahih- prajnam, na ubhyatah-prajnam, na prajaana-ghanam na prajnam na aprajnam; adrshtam avyavahaaryam agraahyam alakshanam acintyam avyapadesyam ekatma-pratyaya-saaram prapancopasamam saantam sivam advaitam……sa atma…"*. Kathopanishad I.ii.20 and I.ii..21 - "Subtler than the subtlest, greater than the greatest". "Nearer than the nearest, farther than the farthest ……..unmoving moving everywhere." *Isavasya Upanishad* 4 – "It is unmoving , one, faster than the mind" (Isavasya Upanishad 8 – "He is all pervasive, pure, bodiless, without wound, without sinews, taintless, untouched by sin, omniscient, ruler of mind, transcendent, and self-existent." Kaivalya Upanishad 17 – "I am that Brahman which illumines the perceived world of waking, dream, and sleep" Kaivalya Upanishad 21 - I see without eyes, hear without ears. Assuming various forms, I know everything. There is no one who is the knower of Me. I am

ever the pure consciousness. " (" .... *Cit sadaa aham*."). Kaivalya Upanishad 18 "I am distinct from all those which are the subject, the object and the instrument. In all the three states - jagrat, swapna and sushupti – I am the witness who is the pure consciousness (*cinmaatra*) and who is ever auspicious." Kaivalya Upanishad 23 – "........the nature of Paramatma which is manifest in the mind, partless, non-dual, the witness of all, distinct from cause and effect and pure..." Taittiriya Upanishad II.iv.1 - "Words and sense organs, along with the mind return, unable to reach That" Mundakopanishad I.i.6 - "That which cannot be seen or grasped, that which has no source, that which has no features, that which has no eyes, ears, etc, that which has no hands, feet etc. that which is eternal, that which is infinite, that which is all pervading, that which is the subtlest of the subtlest, that which is undiminishing and that which is the source of all creation..." Mundakopanishad III.i.8- " "That which cannot be apprehended by sight or by words or by other indriyas.), that which cannot be attained by penance or rituals....The divisionless....." Mundakopanishad III.i.7 – " That (i.e., Brahman) is infinite, effulgent, not accessible to thought, formless, subtler than the subtlest; farther than the farthest. It is, at the same time, near at hand in this body. It is available to be recognized in one's very heart, (i.e., as the consciousness behind the ahamkara)". Kathopanishad I.iii.15 - "That which is soundless, touchless, formless, undecaying, tasteless, internal, smellless, imperishable, immortal, beginningless, endless, (infinite), greater than the greatest, distinct from intelligence, (i.e., distinct from ahamkara) and changelessly constant....." Isavasya Upanishad 5 - "It moves; it does not move. It is far. It is near. It is inside all this. It is outside all this. "Kaivalya Upanishad 20 – "I (Brahman) am smaller than the smallest and, in the same way, I am bigger than the biggest; ....I am the ancient one; I am the ruler of all; I am the effulgent one; I am the very auspiciousness." Kaivalya Upanishad 6 - "Brahman which is the source of all, pure, free from sorrow, beyond thoughts, unmanifested, many-formed (in association with thoughts), auspicious, tranquil, immortal, free from beginning middle and end, non-dual, all pervasive, formless and wonderful and which is consciousness and ananda." Kaivalya Upanishad 7 – "Brahman which is the cause of all beings, the witness of all and beyond Maya." Kaivalya

Upanishad 16 – “You alone are that infinite, eternal, supreme Brahman which is the self of all, which is the abode of all and which is subtler than the subtlest - that Brahman alone are you.” Kaivalya Upanishad 17 – “I am that Brahman which illumines the perceived world of waking dream, sleep, etc.....” Mundakopanishad II.i.2 - “Effulgent, formless, all pervading, pervading the inside and outside of the perceived universe, unborn, without prana and mind, pure, superior to the (other) superior (i.e. Maya)” Svetasvatara Upanishad VI.19 - “Without parts, actionless, beyond fluctuations, free from all defects, untainted, the means of crossing the sea of samsara and attaining moksha)” Kenopanishad I.3 - “Eyes do not reach That nor do words and not even the mind. We do not know ‘That Brahman is of this kind’. How to make Brahman known we do not know” Kenopanishad I. 4.- “ (Because) It is different from the known and It is beyond the unknown – This is what we have heard from our teachers who have taught us about That Brahman.” Kathopanishad II.iii.12 - “Not by words nor by sight and not even by the mind can It be reached. But he who says that It does not exist can never attain It.” Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.ix.26, IV.ii.4, IV.iv.22, and IV.v.15 - “This Atma is that which has been described as ‘Not this, not this’. It is imperceptible, for It is never perceived; undecaying, for It never decays; unattached, for It is never attached; unfettered, It never feels pain and never suffers injury. r.....” Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.20 - “It is to be realized (in accordance with the instructions of a teacher) as non dual (for) It is unknowable, eternal. The Atma is taintless, is superior to unmanifested space (i.e. Maya), is unborn, infinite and constant” Brahadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.20 – “It should be realized in one form only. It is unknowable and eternal. It, the atma, is taintless, beyond space (*akasa*), birthless, infinite and constant”. Chandogya Upanishad VI.ii.1 “O, good looking one, in the beginning this was Existence alone, One only and without a second.” Chandogya Upanishad Viii.i.v – “This (Brahman) does not grow old when the body grows old or die when the body dies (or killed when the body is killed)……….. This is the Atma which is beyond sin, beyond decrepitude, beyond death, beyond sorrow, beyond hunger and thirst….” Kenopanishad I.6 – “That which man does not comprehend with the mind. That by which…..mind is pervaded.” Kenopanishad I.5 – “That which is not uttered by speech, that by

which speech is revealed, know that alone to be Brahman, and not what people worship as an object." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.15 – "This infinite is relationless." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.25 – "That great birthless Atma is undecaying, immortal, undying, fearless (because there is no second thing), and infinite." (The word used for 'fearless is '*abhayam*'. (Sankaracarya interprets abhayam as 'devoid of avidya'). Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.6 – ''Atma is self-effulgent". "Mundaka Upanishad III.i.7 – "It is great because of its all-pervasiveness and It is all pervasive and self-effulgent. Its features cannot be thought of. It is subtler than the subtlest…..Among sentient beings It is perceived as seated in this very body, in the cavity of the heart – ("heart" is the term used for the mind.) Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.viii.8 - ….."This Immutable Brahman is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, neither red color nor oiliness, neither shadow nor darkness, neither air nor ether, unattached, neither taste nor smell, without eyes or ears, without the vocal organ or mind………,without the vital force , not a measure, and without interior or exterior". Kathopanishad I.iii.15 – That which is soundless, touchless, colorless, undiminishing, and also tasteless, eternal, odorless, without beginning, and without end, distinct from Mahat, and ever constant." Brhadaranyaka 3.8.8 – "It does not eat anything nor is It eaten by anybody". ('Eating' refers to experience. So, It is neither the experiencer nor the experienced.) Brhadaranyaka V.iii.22 – "Atma has no punya or papa". Brhadaranyaka IV,iii.30 – "That it does not know in that state, because , though knowing then, it does not know; for the knower's function can never be lost." (This is a description of sushupti, in which out of which the original consciousness and cidabhasa, the original consciousness, sakshi alone is functioning). "Chandogya Upanishad VI.ii.1 – "One only, non-dual". Brahadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.16 – "That to which time is below (i.e. That which is beyond time.") On the same lines, Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.15 – "…. The Lord of all that has been and will be…"And in Brhadaranyaka III.ix.26, IV.ii.4, IV,iv.22 and IV,v.15 – "….. It is "*asitah*" (i.e., not fettered by space, time or entity). Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.iii.6 – "Now therefore the description of (Brahman): 'not this, not this'. Because there is no other and more appropriate description than this 'not this'." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.19 "There is no plurality

whatsoever in It. He who regards the apparent plurality as real goes from death to death." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.20 – "It should be realized in one form only." – Sankaracarya adds in his commentary – "as the homogenous pure caitanyam". Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III. Iv. 1,III.v.1 – That which is self-evident is the Brahman which is within all" Chandogya Upanishad VII.24.i – 'The Infinite is that where one does not see anything else, does not hear anything else and does not know anything else".. That which indeed is the Infinite is immortal." Kathopanishad I.ii.14 – "…that thing which you see as different from dharma , different from adharma, different from cause and effect and different from the past and the future." Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.15 and 17 - ´Lord of the past and the future". "Below which the year with its days rotates". Kathopanishad I.ii.18 – "The intelligent Self is neither born nor does it die. It did not originate from anything, nor did anything originate from It. It is birthless, eternal, undecaying and ancient. It is not injured even when the body is killed". Swesvatara Upanishad, 1.9. Kathopanishad I.ii.19 – "…It does not kill nor is it killed." (I.e. Brahman is akarta and abhokta). Kaivalya Upanishad 21 – "It is without hands or feet". Brhadaranyaka III.iv.2, III.viii.11 – "You cannot see the seer of sight…..you cannot know the knower of the knower" "'It is never seen but is the Seer… It is never known but is the knower. There is no other Seer than It…There is no other knower than It". (These are descriptions of the consciousness in oneself which is self-evident and which one cannot know as an object).

1. Upanishad passages, apart from the four famous mahavakyas which assert the identity of the consciousness recognized in oneself and the all pervading Brahma caitanyam can be found in Taittiriya 2.1.1, Chandogya 6.2.1, 8.2.3, 8.4.1, Swetasvatara 1.12, Brhadaranyaka 1.4.7, 2.4.1 3.4.1, 3.51, 3.8.11, 4.3.7, 4.4.25, Swetasvatara 3.13, 3.18, Aitereya 1.3.11, 3.1.4, Mundaka 2.2.8, 2.2.9, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, Kaivalya 10, 16 etc. The passages have been cited in Note entitled "Refutation Of Plurality Of Atmas And Of Atmas Being Part Of Brahman" in the Appendix.

Section 5 - Unreality of the Perceived world

3. There are various passages in the Upanishads from which we can derive the doctrine of the unreality or the lower order of reality of the perceived world. When Brahman is said to be non-dual, or one without a second (*advayam, advaitam, advidiiyam*, *ekam)* as in Brahadaranyaka, Kaivalya, Chandogya, Mandukya and in Swesvatara or Brahman is said to be infinite, as in Taittiriya and Swesvatara, it means that the perceived world is of lower order of reality. There are numerous other statements indicating the unreality of the experienced perceived world. Brhadaranyaka 4.4.19 and Katha 2.1.11 - "There is no diversity whatsoever in It". (This is negation of *dwaitam*, the ignorant notion that the experienced perceived world is real.) Brhadaranyaka 4.3.31, 2.4.14 and 4.5.15 – "When there is something other than Brahman, as it were, one can see something else.......know something else." The words, "as it were" (or "as though" – "*iva*" in Sanskrit) indicate that everything except Brahman is unreal. Similarly, in Brhadaranyaka mantra IV.iv.19 and Katopanishad II.i.11, the word "iva" is used in the passage "He who sees diversity, as it were, in It goes from death to death" following the passage declaring that "there is no diversity whatsoever in It. "("*neha nana asti kinca na, mrtyoh sa mrtyum apnoti ya iha nana iva pasyati*") The word "iva" referring to the perception of plurality indicates that plurality is unreal. In Taittiriya Upanishad II.vii.1, it is said that whenever the aspirant perceives the slightest difference in It (Brahman), he is smitten with fear, In Brhadaranyaka 2.3.6, 3.9.26, 4.2 4, 4.4.22 and 4.5.15, Brahman is described as "not this, not this" ("*neti neti*") indicating that it is of a higher order of reality than the perceived world. In 3.4.2, 3.5.1, and 3.7.23, talking of Brahman that is immediate and direct, the atma within all, the Upanishad says that except That (i.e., Brahman), everything is *aarttam*. Sankaracarya explains in 3.5.1 that "*aarttam*" means that everything else is perishable, beset with troubles and unsubstantial like dream, illusion or mirage. In Brahadaranyaka 2.3.6, the Upanishad says "Brahman is the Truth of truth, the vital force ("*praana*") is truth, and It is the Truth of that. "Praana" stands for the universe. Also, read with 2.3.1 to 2.3.5, we can see that the word "truth" with "t" in small case refers to the gross and subtle parts of the perceived world and our bodies and Brahman is said to be the Truth of these. This is also meant to show that the perceived

world including our bodies and minds is of a lower of reality than Brahman. .Chandogya 6.8.7 says that It (Brahman) is the subtle essence and the Reality - which implies that the perceived world, the superimposition is unreal. . Distinguishing from the infinite, immortal Brahman, Chandogya 7.24.1 says, "The finite is that that in which one sees something else...... knows something else. That which is finite is mortal." In Prasna 3.3., it is said that from Brahman is born this prana (prana stands for the experienced universe), just as there can be a shadow when a man is there. In Yajurveda it is said of Brahman said that though, It is not one that can be born, it is born as manifold objects—which is a rhetorical assertion of the unreality of creation. In Swetasvatara 3.10, the Upanishad talks of an entity that is superior to that which is superior and says that one who knows that entity which is attributeless and beyond the threefold affliction as oneself becomes immortal. In the commentary, it is said that 'that which is superior' refers to the perceived universe and the entity superior to that refers to Brahman. In the sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad, which deals with Brahman as the eternal unchanging Existence, in 6.1.4, 6.1.5 and 6.1.6, the Upanishad gives the examples of a lump of clay, an ingot of gold and a lump of iron and their formation as a pot, ornament and nail-cutter, respectively, to show that Brahman as the essence, as the Existence, alone is real and the names and forms superimposed on Brahman are unreal." Kaivalya 23 Upanishad says, "There is neither earth nor water nor fire nor air nor space." Aitereya 3.1.3 says that it is Consciousness (i.e., Brahman) that lends reality (existence) to Hiranyagarbha .... the five elements and all creatures.

4. There is also logic in saying that the perceived world is unreal. If the perceived world is real, it cannot be negated by knowledge. Only if *advaitam* (Brahman as the sole reality) is accepted, can we talk of moksha through the knowledge of the *mithyaatvam* of the *dwaitam* and the *satyatvam* of *advaita* (*jaganmithya brahmasatyam*). Another argument which Sankaracarya gives is that space and time are part of the perceived universe, that you cannot talk of a space and time located in which this creation took place¸ because that would lead to infinite regress and that therefore, creation has to be unreal. Suresvaracarya talks of an 'outward view 'and an 'inward' view. Phenomenality and non-existence of the perceived world are not opposed. We

cannot deny the practical reality of the world. From the relative standpoint of avidya, the perceived world exists and is real and meaningful. It is not a mirage. This is the 'outward view. But, from the standpoint of Brahman, there is neither avidya nor the perceived world. This is what Suresvaracarya calls 'the inward view'.

Section 6 - Pramanam

Authority of the Upanishad for Brahman Not Being the Actual Creator.

5. Upanishads indicate specifically that Brahman is not the cause of the perceived universe. Brhadaranyaka 2.5.19 – "Brahman is without prior or posterior". Kathopanishad 1.2.14 "different from cause and effect"; Kathopanishad 1.2.18 – "It did not originate from anything nor did anything originate from it". A real cause has to undergo change to become effect and once a real cause becomes effect, it ceases to exist in that form. Therefore passages in the Upanishads indicating changelessness and eternity would mean that Brahman cannot be the modifying material cause (*parinaami upaadaana kaaranam*) of the perceived world. Muktikopanishad -"It is changeless." Kathopanishad 1.2.18 – "It is neither born nor does it die"; Kathopanishad 1.3.15, Swetasvatara 5.13, Kaivalya 6. - -.Katha 1.2.18, 1.3.15, 2.2.13,, Mundaka 1.1.6 Kaivalya 6, 16; Brhadaranyaka 3.8.8.,, Mundaka 1.1.5.,1.1.7, 1.2.13, 2.1.1., 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.7, 2.2.11, Prasna 4.9, 4.10, Chandogya 8.3.4,, 8.7.4, 8.1..1, 8.12.1., Brhadaranyaka 2.5.1 to 2.5.14, 4.4.16, 4.4.17, 4.4.25,, Katha 2,2.8,, Swetasvatara 1.7, 1.10, 4.8, 4.18, 5.6, 6.6, 6.17, 6.13, 6.19. – "It is immutable" "It is transcendental" "It is without beginning (*anaadi*)", "It is birthless (ajah)", "It is without end (*anantam)"* "It is eternal (*nityam*)", "It is indestructible (*aksharam)*", "It is immortal (*amrtam*)". So, Brahman modifying and becoming the perceived universe is illogical. . In Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya Vartikam, Sureswaracarya gives three reasons to show why Brahman cannot be actual creator. (I) Brahman is all-pervasive. So, there cannot be anything that can be Its effect. (ii) Brahman is one and non-dual. So, there cannot be a second entity to be related with It in terms of cause-effect relation. (iii) Brahman is immutable. Creation involves not only transformation of matter but visualisation and action. Therefore, Upanishad

mantras negating thinking and action on the part of Brahman would mean that Brahman cannot be the intelligent cause (*nimitta kaaranam*) of the perceived universe. Swetasvatara 1.9, 6.19 – "It is actionless" "; Swetasvatara 6.8 – "It has neither body nor instruments" "; Katha 1.2.19 -"It does not kill nor is It killed (this negates action and enjoyment and suffering)" Brhadaranyaka 3.8.8 – "That immortal does not have vocal organ or a mind". Mundaka 2.1.2 – 'It does not have vital force or a mind ". In Kaivalya 22, Brahman, speaking in the first person says, "I have neither birth nor body, nor sense organs nor the mind-intellect equipment. (*Na janma dehendriya buddhih asti*) So, Brahman being the intelligent cause (nimitta *kaaranam*) of the universe is also not logical. But Upanishads do say in other places that Brahman visualised, wished, thought, deliberated on creation, vide Chandogya 6.2.3 , Taittiriya 2.6.1, Aitereya 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.3.1.,1.3.2, 1.3.11 and created the perceived universe, vide Chandogya 6.2.3, Taittiriya 2.1.1 ",,2,7.1, 3.1.1, Aitareya 1.1.2. The explanation is twofold. (a) The universe is not a real product of Brahman. Brahman is not a modifying material cause (not "*parinami upaadaana kaaranam".)* It is not like milk becoming curd. It is only *vivarta upaadaana karanam*. "*Vivarta*" is a technical term, indicating the unreality of creation. (The unreality of Brahman becoming many is indicated by the prefix 'pra' in the passage 'bahusyaam prajaayeti' in Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.3.). Brahman does not undergo any modification. In its nature as all pervading Existence, it is just available as the substratum (*adhishthanam)* for nama roopa to be superimposed. The actual material cause (*parinami upaadaana kaaranam*) is Maya which superimposes, on the sub-stratum, the differentiated nama roopa on account of which we perceive a world of objects. Similarly, the entity that visualises and designs the names and forms to be superimposed and impels Maya to unfold and superimpose the names and forms is Iswara. Iswara is Maya in which the Consciousness aspect of Brahman (Brahma caitanyam**)** is reflected. (In Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya Vartikam, Sureswaracarya gives three reasons to show why Brahman cannot be actual creator. (I) Brahman is all-pervasive. So, there cannot be anything that can be Its effect. (ii) Brahman is one And non-dual. So, there cannot be a second entity to be related with It in terms

of cause-effect relation. (iii) Brahman is immutable. So, Brahman cannot be the cause of the world.)

Section 7 - Brahman as Existence

The Sub-Stratum of the Universe of Names and Forms

6. In various Upanishads we see that Brahman is said to be the sub-stratum ("adhishtaanam") of the universe. Words such as "sub-stratum" "root" "support" "That in which things are fixed " occur in Katha 1.2.11, 2.2.8. 2.3.1, Brhadaranyaka 2.5.15, Brhadaranyaka 4.4.17, Mundaka 2.2.2 Chandogya 8.14.1, Taittiriya 3.10.3, Nrsimhaottaratapaniya 2 and Ramottaratapaniya. Swetasvatara 1.8 talks of Brahman as the support of the unmanifested and the manifest universe. Chandogya VI.viii.4, starting from food and passing through water and fire, says, "O, good-looking one, through fire as the sprout understand Existence as the root and concludes "All these things have Existence as their root. Existence is their abode. Existence is their place of merger". In the fifth section of the second chapter of Brhadaranyaka Upanishad declares that the shining immortal being (Brahman, atma) is in the cosmic body. In 2.5.1 to 14, Yajnavalkya talks of the effulgent immortal being (Brahman, atma) as the earth, water, fire, air, space, sun, moon, the human species, the cosmic body etc.., as associated with them, as being the underlying unity and as Brahman and as the Self. Brhadaranyaka III,iv.1 and 2 talk of Brahman as the inner essence of all (sarvaantarah). In the eighth section of the third chapter of Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, Iswara 's pervasion of the universe is metaphorically said to be the warp and woof of earth, water, fire etc. , Iswara is referred to as the unmanifested space and in the eighth mantra, the Immutable Brahman is said to be That that pervades Iswara. In Chandogya Upanishad mantrasVI.iii.2 .and VIII.xiv.1. the words, "namaroope vyakaravaani" and " namaroopayoh nirvahitaa" occur. The first says "I (referring to Brahman) shall clearly manifest name and form (- we have to add 'through Iswara'}. The second (based on Sankaracarya's commentary) says"Thatwhich is indeed called space (i.e. Brahman) is the manifester of name and form. (Again, we have to add 'through Iswara') ('Space' is a word often

used in Upanishads to refer to Brahman.) Sankaracarya's commentary - "Because like space, It is bodiless and subtle." Sankaracarya gives the example of water manifesting foam. Sankaracarya goes on to say "That which exists in the names and forms (i.e., that which is the support,the substratum of nama roopa) is Brahman. That is not touched by name and form, is different from name and form (and) yet it is their manifester. That is immortal. That is the Atma." Chandogya 6.3.2 – speaking of Existence-Brahman, "That Deity….deliberated, 'Well, by entering into these three gods (fire, water and earth, in the form of each individual jiva, let me manifest name and form'". Brhadaranyaka Upanishad I.vi.1 –"The (experienced) universe verily is made up of three things – name, form, function." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad I.iv.7 – "The universe was then undifferentiated. It differentiated itself only as name and form. So even now the universe is only manifested as name and form – it gets such and such name and such and such form." Taittiriya Upanishad mantra II.vii.1 – "In the beginning all this was the unmanifested. From that emerged the manifested (*asat va idam agra aasiit; tato vai sat ajaayata*". And in Brahadaranyaka 1.4.7, the Upanishad says that Brahman entered the universe. Explaining the word, "entered", Sankaracarya says that, like the reflection of the sun etc. in water, the entrance of Brahman means only Its being perceived like a reflection in the differentiated universe. Before the manifestation of the differentiated universe, Brahman is not perceived, but after the differentiated universe is manifested, Brahman is perceived within the intellect. like the reflection of the sun, etc. in water and the like. What this amounts to is that Brahman has to be recognized as the sub-stratum of Existence, in general and, in particular, as the consciousness behind the minds and as the source of the reflected consciousness in the minds. In his commentary on Chandogya, 6, 8,7, Sankaracarya says "The Self (Atma, Brahman) through which all this universe becomes possessed of its self (Existence) That itself is the source called Existence, the Truth, the Supreme Reality. Hence that indeed is the self of the world, its inmost, its quintessence, its very reality" In his commentary on Taittiriya 2.6.1, explaining the word, "praajaayaayeti" Sankaracarya explains, "Multiplication, here, does not refer to something becoming extraneous as one does by begetting a son. How then? Through the manifestation of

name and form -- Then that evolution of name and form is (what is called) the appearance of Brahman as the many. In no other way is it possible for the partless Brahman to become either multiple or finite, as for instance the finitude and plurality of space are surely the creations of extraneous factors. .....Therefore it is only because of Brahman that name and form have their being under all circumstances, but Brahman does not consist of them. They are said to be essentially Brahman since they cease to exist when Brahman is eliminated.. Again, in the commentary on Taittiriya 2.6.1, Sankaracarya says, "....there being no existence for any of these modifications of name and form apart from the Brahman". From these also, it is clear that Brahman in Its aspect as the eternal unchanging Existence provides the sub-stratum, that the sub-stratum is alone real and the changing nama roopa superimposed on It are unreal.. (In all passages which talk of manifestation of nama roopa, by Brahman, (e.g., Chandogya 6.32 – "………entered into these three deities through this jiva and differentiated nama roopa"), we have to understand that the manifestation of the universe is due to the unfolding of the Maya part of Iswara and not any transformation of Brahman. Brahman's role is only the eternal presence as Existence, the substratum for the alternation of unevolved and evolved nama roopa. Brahman is also the sub-stratum for the vyavaharika mithya Maya, just as the rope is the sub-stratum for the pratibhasika mithya snake.

1. When we say that Brahman is non-dual or Brahman alone is real, we are referring to the paramarthika satyam. When we say that Brahman is everything, we are including vyavaharika satyam and referring to the substratum, the paramarthika satyam and the names and forms, the vyavaharika satyam, superimposed on It, together, without prejudice to the latter being of a lower order of reality (Brahma satyam jaganmithya). When we say that the world is unreal or mithya, we are referring to the names and forms only, thevyavaharika satyam.

7. Brahman is not just Existence but Existence-Consciousness-Infinity. However, the Consciousness aspect is recognizable only in certain forms of nama roopa, what we call the

animate as distinguished from the inanimate. But the essence of the entire cosmos is Brahman alone. In Brhadaranyaka, from 3.7.2 to 3.8.11, the Upanishad leads us from the subtle principle of the universe (Hiranyagarbha, called s*ootra),* from sootra to the causal principle *(*Iswara, called *antaryami* and *aakasa*) – up to this, the vyavaharika prapanca - and from akasa to the absolute, Brahman, called *aksharam* (the Immutable) – i.e., from the *samashti sukhma prapanca upahita caitanyam* to *samashti kaarana prapanca upahita caitanyam* to *nirupaadhika caitanyam*. (This is to teach us that the ultimate essence is nirguna Brahman, not any form of saguna Brahman). Brhadaranyaka 3.7.23, dealing with Iswara, the Inner Controller, Iswara and 3.8.1, dealing with nirguna Brahman as" it is never the known, but is the Knower; there is no other Knower than He/It". Description in the same terms indicates that Iswara, in His real nature is Brahman. There is only one Brahman on which the notions of jiva and Iswara are superimposed. In his commentary on 3.8.12, which concludes the topic, Sankaracarya says, "What is the difference between them, the Immutable (aksharam) and the Internal Ruler (antaryami)?Intrinsically there is neither difference nor idenitity among them, for they are by nature pure Consciousness……The unconditioned Self (nirupadhika atma) , being beyond speech and mind, devoid of attributes and one, is designated as 'not this, not this'; when it has the limiting adjuncts (upadhis) of the body and organs, which are characterized by avidya , desire and work, It is called the samsari jiva and when the atma has the limiting adjunct of the power of eternal and unsurpassable knowledge (i.e. Maya), It is called the Internal Ruler, Iswara. The same atma, nirupadhika, absolute and pure, by nature is called the Immutable, the Supreme (aksharam, para). Similarly, having the limiting adjuncts of the bodies and organs of Hiranyagarbha, the Undifferentiated, the gods, the species, the individual, man, animal, spirits etc., and the atma assumes the particular names and forms. Thus we have explained through the Sruti vakyam 'It moves and does not move' (Isavasya 5). In this light alone such texts as 'This is your atma (within all) (Brhadaranyaka 3.4.1,2 and 3.5.1), "He is the inner self of all beings (Mundaka 2.1.4), 'This (Brahman) is hidden in all beings' (Katha 1.3.12), Thou art That (Chandogya 5.8.7), 'I myself am all this' (Chandogya 7.25.1), 'All this but the atma'(

Chandogya7.25.1) and ‘There is no other witness but He’ (Brhadaranyaka 3.7.23) will not become contradictory; in any other view they cannot be harmonized. Therefore the entities mentioned above differ only because of their limiting adjuncts, but not in any other manner, for all the Upanishads conclude ‘One only without a second‘ (Chandogya 6.2.1).

To say that ‘everything’ is Brahman is the same thing as to say ‘Brahman alone is real; the world is mithya’ – vide Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.v.7 - “idam sarvam yadayam atma’. Idam sarvam yadayamatma = Everything that is here is atma = Nothing exists separate from atma = Everything is dependent on atma for its existence. Whatever has dependend existence is mithya = everything other than atma is mithya = The nama roopas including our body mind complexes are mithya. Even Iswara is mithya.

Section 8 - Creator is Iswara Together with Maya

1. We have already seen in Section 6 that the since Brahman is non-dual, eternal, changeless, and devoid of attributes and devoid of instruments of knowledge and action, Brahman cannot be creator of the perceived world, whether as the material cause or the intelligent cause, though passages are there saying that Brahman visualized and Brahman created the universe. We have to look for an entity or entities other than Brahman, as the intelligent and material cause (parinaaami upaadaana kaaranam and nimitta kaaranam) of the universe. In certain passages, Upanishad itself introduces Maya and talks of creation proceeding from the association of Brahman with Maya. In abhasa vada we regard this association to be a reflection of Brahma caitanyam in Maya and we talk of the entity formed by such reflection as Iswara and we attribute to Iswara the functions of visualizing creation and impelling Maya to unfold nama roopa and superimpose the nama roopa on the sub-stratum, Brahman, the Existence. And, so, even though the word, “Brahman” and “ Iswara” occur without a clear distinction, wherever we meet with passages in the Upanishads which talk of

omniscience and omnipotence, or of visualization or the act of creation or of differentiation of nama roopa, we have to take them to refer to such an Iswara aided by Maya as the cause of the perceived universe, the nirguna Brahman (the pure Existence-Consciousness- Infinity) serving only as the sub-stratum , without undergoing any change.), Since Brahman is non-dual, Iswara and Maya have, necessarily, to be of a lower order of reality.

2. In his bhashyam on Brahmasutra II.ii.14, Sankaracarya makes the following statements:-
    - Brahman is changeless and eternal and cannot undergo any modification whatsoever.
    - Origin, continuance and dissolution of the world would result from 'Iswara' who is by nature eternal, pure, consciousness and free, as also omniscient and omnipotent.
    - Nama roopa, which are in the omniscient 'Iswara' conjured up by avidya which cannot be categorized as existent or non-existent, the seed of the samsara universe, are mentioned in the sruti and smriti as the Maya sakti of the omniscient Iswara or as Prakriti.
    - 'Iswara' conforms to the limiting adjuncts - nama roopa – created by avidya, like space conforming to the conditioning factors like pot, jar etc.
    - 'Iswara's rulership, omniscience and omnipotence are contingent on the limiting adjuncts (upadhis) conjured up by avidya.
    - Sruti also talks of functions like rulership only in the vyavaharika plane. Though we do not get a clear picture from these, this much is certain – Nirguna Brahman is not the creator. Creation is a matter of nama roopa conjured up by Maya. God conforms to the limiting adjuncts, the nama roopa, created by Maya.

3. As an example of the same entity being both the intelligent cause and the material cause of the universe, Upanishad refers to the spider producing the web out of its own body guided by its own instinct (vide Mundaka 1.1.7 - "Just as the spider spins out the web out of its own body and withdraws it unto itself, so out of the Immutable does the universe emerge here (in this phenomenal creation.)". Another example is the person perceiving his own vasanas as a dream world. He is not only the creator of the dream inasmuch as it is he who is creating a dream world but the raw material for the dream world is also his own vasanas. Like that Iswara is not only the visualizer, but the material for creation is also in Iswara as Maya.

8. What are the Upanishad passages from which we can derive Iswara, together with Maya, being the cause of the universe?

Mundaka Upanishad I.i.9 - "That omniscient One ....from His envisioning (jnanamaya tapah')does Hiranyagarbha and this universe ofnama roopa originate." Chandogya Upanishad VI.ii.3- "That (Existence) visualized(*tat aikshata*) 'I shall become many. I shall be born." Taittiriya Upanishad II.vi.1 – "He (the Self) wished (*sa akamayata*) 'Let be many. Let me be born..........He undertook a deliberation (*sa tapah atapyata*). Having deliberated, he created all that exists."- Aitereya UpanishadI.i.1 "........He thought (*sa aikshata*) 'let me create the worlds'

Swetasvatara Upanishad IV.1—"Know Maya to be *prakriti*) and *maheswara* to be *mayii* .Prakriti is the word used for the material cause of the universe. Mayii means the master of Maya." Swetasvatara IV. 9 says that Mayii creates veda .....and whatever is mentioned in the Veda, i.e. the entire universe. In the commentary, which some believe is Sankaracarya's, the question is asked, "How can the changeless Brahman be the creator of the universe?" The answer given is that that is possible because of Its power called Maya. Maya conjures up the universe and owing to the influence of that Maya, jivas regard themselves to be different from

Brahman and wallow in the ocean of samsara. Swetasvatara Upanishad I.9 talks of three unborn entitles- (i) *jna* (the omniscient), the *iisa* (the ruler), (ii) *ajna* (the ignorant), *aniisa* (the ruled) and (iii) *eka bhoktrubhogyaayukta* (the one ordained to provide experienceable objects for the experiencer), says that the infinite atma is in the form of the universe and is akarta. It concludes saying that the one who realizes the three – iisa, aniisa and bhoktrybhogyaayukta - to be Brahman (is liberated). In the commentary, jna, ajna and bhoktrubhogygayukta are equated to Iswara, jiva and prakriti (i.e. Maya). The significance of this passage is that Iswara and Maya are distinguished from nirguna Brahman. (In the commentary, here also, there is a discussion as to how the changeless non-dual abhokta Brahman be in the form of Iswara, jiva and the universe. And the answer given, again, is that on account of the upadhi, Maya, associated with Maya Brahman appears to be divided into the products of Maya - Iswara, jiva and the universe. And it is clarified that there is no question of duality because the anirevacaniiya Maya is not a substance. Knowing Iswara, jiva and the universe to be Brahman means that Brahman is the adhishtanam and since Iswara, jiva and the universe are products of Maya (i.e. mithya), they are not different entities. Swetasvatara 1.7 says that the three are supported by Parabrahman. In the commentary, in keeping with 1.12, the three are said to refer to bhokta, bhogyam and *prerita* (i.e. jiva, jagat and Iswara). 1.12 says that bhokta, bhogyam and prerita are said to be Brahman. In the commentary, it is clarified that 'bhokta' refers to jiva, 'bhogyam' to the jagat and 'prerita' to antaryami, parameswara. Though as, Swami Mrdananda points out, the distinction of jiva, jagat and Iswara as three entities is relevant only in the state of ignorance and when one gains knowledge one will come to know that they are all only manifestations of the non-dual Brahman, the significance of 1.7 and 1.12 is that Iswara is mentioned as an entity separate from Brahman and as the impeller (i.e. the one who sets in motion the creation process) and as the Inner Controller. (In the Sastra, the Inner Controller, antaryami, is an appellation of iiswara). Swetasvatara 4.12 talks of the creator of gods as *maharshi* (all-seeing, i.e. omniscient). Swetasvatara 1.11 distinguishes jnanam and upasana. It says by jnanam (the knowledge. 'I am Brahman') one gets freed of papa and other afflictions and overcomes the cycle of births and

deaths. It continues and says that, by meditation on Brahman, one attains Iswara, on the fall of the physical body, enjoys, there, visvaaiswaryam (all auspicious benefits) and, getting all desires fulfilled and realizing identity with nirguna Brahman (cf. commentary), at the end, becomes Brahman. The significance of this mantra also, is that Iswara is distinguished from nirguna Brahman (- the word used for Brahman is 'kevala'). 1. 10 talks of the one God who rules over *Pradhaana* and *atma* (here, the word 'atma' refers to jivatma) (in the commentary the word, is 'Purusha'). The significance is that the mantra goes on to say that by meditating on that God, and (later) by *tattabhaava* (knowing 'I am Brahman') one gets liberated from *visvamaaya*. Pradhanam is the word for the material cause of the universe in the Sankhya system ands has been borrowed in Advaita Vedanta as the equivalent of Maya. Viswamaya means samsara. Swetasvatara 6.16 – "He (Brahman) is the creator of the universe, the knower of the universe (*viswavid*), the atma of all, the origin of all, the omniscient, the creator of time, one endowed with attributes (such as freedom papa) (*gunii*), the repository of all knowledge, the master of pradhanam and intellect of jivas (*kshestrajna*, *vijnanaatma*), the ruler of gunas, i.e satva, rajas, tamas, - which means Maya - and the cause of the bondage by, experience of and liberation from samsara. The significance is that the mantra talks of saguna Brahman, Brahman endowed with omniscience as being the ruler of Maya and being the creator. Swetasvatara 1.8 – "The ruler of the universe (i.e. Iswara) rules over the perishable manifested universe (*ksharam, vyaktam*) and the imperishable unmanifested (*aksharam, avyaktam*) and also the jivas who are bound by the notion of being bhoktas." In the commentary, it is said that by meditating on the sopadshika paramatma in the macrocosmic and microcosmic forms (*samashti* and *vyashti*) and gaining knowledge of the nirupadhika Iswara, one gets liberated. Swetasvatara Upanishad VI.17 talks of Brahman as being in the form of the universe, as immortal, as being in the form of Iswara (*iisasamsthah*), the knower of everything, , all pervading, protector of the universe and as the one who administers (the laws of) this universe, because no other entity is capable of doing so. In Kaivalya Upanishad 7, there is mention of Iswara, saguna Brahman, clearly distinguished from nirguna Brahman; this mantra talks of meditation on Parameswara, the Lord, with three

eyes and blue neck, the cause of all the manifested world and the witness of all. In his commentary on 3.8.12, which concludes the topic, Sankaracarya says, “What is the difference between them, the Immutable (aksharam) and the Internal Ruler (antaryami)?Intrinsically there is neither difference nor idenitity among them, for they are by nature pure Consciousness……The unconditioned Self (nirupadhika atma) , being beyond speech and mind, devoid of attributes and one, is designated as ‘not this, not this’; when it has the limiting adjuncts (upadhis) of the body and organs, which are characterized by avidya , desire and work, It is called the samsari jiva and when the atma has the limiting adjunct of the power of eternal and unsurpassable knowledge (i.e. Maya), It is called the Internal Ruler, Iswara. The same atma, nirupadhika, absolute and pure, by nature is called the Immutable, the Supreme (aksharam, para). Similarly, having the limiting adjuncts of the bodies and organs of Hiranyagarbha, the Undifferentiated, the gods, the species, the individual, man, animal, spirits etc., and the atma assumes the particular names and forms. Chulika Upanishad talks of Maya as the cause of modification. Gopichand Upanishad talks of “mayaasahita Brahman”. Certain other Upanishads also talk of Maya as the power of Brahman or of Brahman with Maya (Mayasahita Brahman) in connection with creation. In Brhadaranyaka Upanishad first chapter, section 2 and 3, we see Hiranyagarbha creating the five elements, and living being including gods and asuras and animals. Prasnopabishad 1.4 also talks of Prajapati (i.e. Hiranyagarbha) as deliberating (on knowledge acquired in the past life and which related to objects revealed by the Vedas) and creating the pair of food and prana (which stand respectively the experiener and the experienced. In Swetasvatara Upanishad VI.18 (and in Yogasara Upanishad), it is said that Iswara created Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) first and gave the Veda to him. In Mundaka Upanishad also, in 1.1.1., it is said that Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) was the first among the gods to be born. Kaivalya 6 talks of Brahman as “brahmayonim” (the cause of Brahmaa, i.e. Hiranyagarbha). Iswara alone is uncreated. All gods, personified aspects of Iswara’s cosmic functions are all created. (Iswara, Maya, jiva, karma and time are alone beginningless in the vyavaharika plane). Hiranyagarbha is the personified aspect of Iswara in his function as creator.

We also find in Bhagavadgita Prakriti as the modifying material cause and the instrument used by the Lord for creation vide 7.6, 9.7, 9.8, 9.10, 13.19 and 13.20.) . Maya consists of matter only and can only be the material cause of the universe. For any entity being the intelligent cause, consciousness has to be derived from the Brahman, the non-dual Consciousness.

4. On the basis of the passages cited in the present section and the previous section, we arrive at an entity called Iswara, constituted of Maya in which Brahma caitanyam is reflected , as the intelligent cause (nimitta karanam), visualizing and planning creation in accordance with the karma of jivas and guided and impelled by him Maya, as the modifying material cause (parinami upadana karanam) transforming into the perceived world, i.e. what was nama roopa in unevolved form becoming manifested nama roopa and being superimposed on the changeless substratum, the Existence-Consciousness, Brahman, by the combination of which sub-stratum and the superimposed nama roopa we are able to experience the universe, though what we perceive is only the nama roopa. Brahman, the sub-stratum is not only Existence. It is also Consciousness. Some of the nama roopa, viz., our minds are so constituted that they can reflect the Consciousness aspect of Brahman, the sub-stratum. Thus, the minds of living beings become conscious entities and they, in turn lend sentiency to the sense organs and bodies.
5. Though Iswara, instead of Brahman, is postulated as the intelligent and material cause of the universe.("abhinna nimitta upaadaana kaaranam") and Maya becomes the changing cause of the universe (parinami upadana karanam) we call Brahman as the "vivarta kaaranam" of the universe, because Brahman does not undergo change when nama roopa are superimposed. But, without undergoing any change, the Existence aspect of Brahman serves as the sub-stratum for nama roopa to be superimposed. But for the existence of the sub-stratum, the unreal universe cannot appear. The false snake that is perceived on the rope encountered in semi-darkness cannot appear but

for the existence of the rope. Brahman is also, indirectly, the nimitta kaaranam, because, but for the presence of Brahma caitanyam, Iswara will not have the reflected consciousness, which enables him to function as the intelligent cause of the universe.

6. As examples of the same entity being both the intelligent cause and the material cause of the universe, Upanishad gives the example of the spider producing the web out of its own body guided by its own instinct (vide Mundaka 1.1.7 - "Just as the spider spins out the web out of it own body and withdraws it unto itself, so out of the Immutable does the universe emerge here (in this phenomenal creation.)". Another example is the person perceiving his own vasanas as a dream world. He is not only the creator of the dream inasmuch as it is he who is creating a dream world but the raw material for the dream world is also his own vasanas. Like that Iswara is not only the visualizer, but the material for creation is also in Iswara as Maya.

Section 9 - Status of Maya

9. The avarana sakti of Mayii is indicated in certain Upanishads. - Swetasvatara Upanishad 1.3 talks of Paramatma being veiled by the three gunas (satva, rajas, and tamas of His power (*paramaatmasakti)*. Paramatmasakti is Maya). 1.6 says that jivas, regarding themselves to be different from Iswara (*prerita*), get caught up in samsara and, blessed by Iswara, attain immortality through Iswara. 1.8 says that jivas are bound on account of the sense of enjoyership (bhoktrubhava). Kaivalya 12 says "The jivatma deluded by Maya, identifies with the body, does all and actions". Krishna Upanishad talks of the world being deluded by Maya. Swetasvatara IV.9 also talks of jivas being under the influence of Maya. (Delusion caused by Maya and the power of Maya which veils our Bramatvam is mentioned in Bhagawadgita 7.5, 7.13, 7.15 and 7.25.)

10. That Maya does not enjoy the same order of reality as Brahman we can infer from certain Upanishad mantras. The non-dual nature of Paramatma itself excludes the existence of any other entity of the same order of reality. Maya is no exception. Besides we have Upanishad

mantras which indicate the lower status of Maya. Following the Sankhya system, the first category in the order of the evolution of the differentiated universe is called 'Mahat'. Katopanishad I.3.11 says, "Superior to Mahatis Avyaktam (i.e. Maya). Superior to Avyaktam is 'Purusha' (i.e., the infinite, Brahman). There is nothing superior to Purusha. He is the ultimate and He is the supreme goal." Mundaka Upanishad III.ii.8 – "The *vidwaan* (i.e., the one who has known himself to be Brahman), having become freed from name and form, reaches the self-fulgent Purusha (i.e. Brahman) that is superior to the superior." Here,the second "superior" refers to Maya. Mundaka Upanishad II.i.2 "Purusha (i.e., the infinite, Brahman) is transcendental, because It is formless, complete, coextensive with all that is external and internal, birthless, without prana and without mind, pure and superior to the superior *aksahara* (imperishable)." (Here also, the second "superior" called akshara refers to Maya and Brahmanis said to be superior even to Maya. Maya is said to be aksharam (imperishable) because it is an endless cycle of projection and resolution of nama roopa and it is said to be superior because in its status as the cause of the material universe, it is superior to the its effect, the projected universe. (The word 'akshara' (imperishable) has different meanings in different contexts. In Mundaka Upanishad passage "aksharaat paratah parah", the word, 'aksharam' means Maya. In Brhadaranyaka 3.8,10 and 11, the word, 'aksharam' means nirguna Brahman. In Brahadaranyaka 3.8.9, the word, aksharam means 'Iswara'.)

The same kind of phrase "paraatpara" as a description of Brahman occurs elsewhere. Swetasvatara Upanishad 3.8 and Kaivalya Upanishad 7 and Swetasvatara Upanishad 3.3 stalk of Brahman as being beyond Maya (tamasahparastaat). Svetasvatara Upanishad 5.1. is a very clear enunciation of the lower status of Maya. It says that in the imperishable, infinite Brahman rest vidya and avidya; vidya is imperishable (in the sense that once the covering of avidya is overcome, vidya, the knowledge of one's nature of Brahman is indestructible); avidya is perishable (in the sense that the avidya-covering is destroyed when one gains the knowledge of jiva brahma aikyam); the one who rules over these (the atma) is different from the two..

(On the macrocosmic scale, superimposed on the Existence-Consciousness-Infinity and endowed with the reflected consciousness the universal causal body is called " Iswara", the universal subtle body is called "Hiranyagarbha", and the universal gross body is called " Virat". On the microcosmic scale, similarly superimposed on the Existence-Consciousness-Infinity and endowed with the reflected consciousness, the individual causal body is called "praajna" and it experiences the deep sleep state, the individual subtle body is called "taijasa" and experiences the dream state and the individual gross body is called "visva" and it experiences the waking state.)

Section 10 - Brahman as Consciousness

All Pervading and Immanent in Beings as Atma

1. We experience mind as a conscious entity entertaining one thought after another. Various Upanishad passages teach us that, superior to the mind, we have in us an unchanging consciousness, called atma or pratyagatma or sakshi. Apart from the four famous mahavakyas, many of them reiterate that the pratyagatma is none other than Brahman. Thus, Upanishads make it clear that there are not many atmas but there is only one all pervading, divisionless, non-dual consciousness; it is this consciousness that is available for recognitionby individual beings through observation of the functioning of the mind. Kaivalya Upanishad 10 – "Clearly recognizing Atma to be present in all beings and clearly recognizing all beings in oneself......." Isavasya Upanishad 6 – " He who sees all beings as non-different from his Atma and sees the Atma of those beings as his own Atma...."Kaivalya Upanishad 16 – "You alone are that Infinite eternal supreme Brahman which is the Atma of all....." Kaivalya Upanishad 17– "I am that Brahman which illumines the worlds of waking, dream, sleep etc." Kaivalya Upanishad 14 refers to Jivatma as indivisible Bliss-Consciousness (aanandam

akhandabodham) in whom alone the three ‘cities’ go into dissolution”. (‘Three cities’ refers to the jagrat prapanca, the swapna prapanca and the sushupti prapanca, i.e., the sthoola, sukshma, karana prapancas – this negates the idea of plurality of atmas). Taittiriya Upanishad II.1 and I.6, Mundaka Upanishad III.i.7, Svetasvatara Upanishad III.11 and Brhadaranyaka Upanishad I.iv.7 talk of Brahman as being available for recognition as Sakshi in the Jivatma (- interpretations based on Sankaracarya’s commentary -) (“yo veda nihitam guhayam” “ Tat srushtva tat eva pravisat.”, “nihitam guhayam” ”sarva bhoota guahasaya” “sa esha pravishtah”) . Similarexpressions occur in Svetasvatara Upanishad mantras III.7, IV.15, IV.16, IV.17, VI.11, Mundaka Upanishad II.i.10, Kaivalya Upanishad 23 etc. Kena Upanishad1.6 – “That which man does not comprehend with the mind, that by which, they say, the mind is encompassed, know that to be Brahman”. (What encompasses the mind is the atma. ‘That atma is Brahman’ means that there is the only common atma in all). Svetasvatara III.19 -“Though It is devoid of hands and legs, It grasps everything and moves about everywhere. Though It is devoid of eyes, It sees everything. Though It is devoid of ears ,It hears everything. Though It is devoid of mind, It knows everything but nobody knows It. The rishis call It the First, the infinite and the Supreme.” (This is a reference to Brahman as being the atma in all, appearing to see etc. when the cidabhasa is seeing etc.). Mundaka Upanishad II.ii.9 - “In the supreme bright sheath i.e., in the vijnanamaya kosa, the intellect of individual beings, is Brahman, the light of lights (“jytotisham jyoti”), free from taints and divisionless (“virajam, nishkalam)” Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.7 talks of the infinite entity (Purusha) as being in the midst of the organs as the self-effulgent light within the heart. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.32 – “........one, the witness, without a second (the reference is to sakshi). This is the sphere of Brahman.” Kathopanishad II.ii.9, 10, 11 and 12 talk of Atmaas being the one in all beings. Taittiriya II.1.which is invoked as 1 – “Satyam Jnanam Anantam Brahma; He who knows that Brahman as hidden in the cavity that is

the intellect..........” Mundaka Upanishad II.i.10 -“He who knows this supremely immortal Brahman as hidden in the cavity that is the intellect....” (Brahman is Existence-Consciousness-Infinity. As the eternal Existence forming the substratum of nama roopa – Sat – It is recognizable everywhere but as Consciousness- cit – It can be appreciated only as the witness of the mind.) Mundaka Upanishad III.i.7 – “It (Brahman) is great (because of its all pervasiveness) and self-effulgent..... It is further away than the far off. It is near at hand in this body. Among sentient beings, it is perceived in the cavity of the heart (.i.e. the intellect) by the enlightened”. “Swetasvatara Upanishad II.15 – “When one knows atmaas Brahman”. Kenopanishad I.2. - “The ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the speech of the speech, the breath of the breath, the eye of the eye.” Those who know this atma, after giving up identification with the sense organs and renouncing this world become immortal.” (“Mind of the mind” means that atma is different from the mind and is superior to the mind). Kenopanishad 1.6 – “That which man does not comprehend with the mind, that, by which, they say, the mind is comprehended, know that to be Brahman.” A very clear support for the proposition that the original consciousness available in Jivatmas is none other than the consciousness that is Brahman occurs in Chandogya Upanishad VIII.xii.3. It says, “This tranquil one, that is, jivatma, rising up from this body (the reference is to videhamukti) becomes one with the Supreme Light(i.e., Brahman) and is established in his own nature.” (The words, “ becomes one with the Supreme light” and “ is established in his own nature” clearly mean that the consciousness constituting the essence of the individual jivatmas called Atma is the same as the all pervading, infinite consciousness called Brahman.) Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.13- (based on Sankaracarya’s commentary”) – “He, the knower of Brahman, who has realized and intimately known the Self – How? – as the innermost Self – as ‘I am the supreme Brahman’ that has entered this place (the body)..............all this is his Atma and he is the Atma of all.....” “In Aiterya Upanishad mantra III.1.2, enumerating various

functions of the mind, it is said that all these are the names of Consciousness and III. 2. 3 says that this atma is Brahman.

Section 11 - Reflected Consciousness (Cidabhasa)

11. While the existence of a changing conscious entity which we call the mind and an unchanging conscious entity which is referred as the atma or Pratyagatma or Sakshi is a matter of personal experience, the fact that what there is in the mind (antahkarana) is the reflected consciousness is a matter of inference. Since Brahma caitanyam is all pervading, the question arises why is it that we experience only our antahkarana as a conscious entity and our body and sense organs as sentient and why things we categorize as inanimate objects are not sentient. This disparity cannot be explained unless we predicate a reflected consciousness and a special capacity, onaccount of its subtlety, on the part of antahkarana to reflect consciousness and to impart it to the sense organs and the body. - which capacity grosser nama roopa like table etc do not possess. There are variouspassages in the Upanishads to show that the body mind complex by itself is inert (being made of food – vide Chandogya Upanishad VI.v.4 and VI.vi.2) and it is the atma that lends sentience and consciousness to the body, sense organs and the antahkarana. Cf. the portion in Taittiriya Upanishad III.7.i which says, " ....Because if the space-like all pervading .....Brahman was not there, who could inhale and exhale?.....This one, this supreme atma which resides in the heart (i.e., in the mind, as the witness of all thoughts) blesses everyone with consciousness and happiness." Commenting on Kenopanishad I.i –("Directed by whom does the mind pervade the objects? Directed by whomdoes prana function?" and I.i - ".....the mind of the mind, the prana of the prana.....")‚Sankaracarya says,"Because the antahkarana is not able to perform its functions – thinking, determination etc. – unless it is illumined by the light of consciousness."). Similarly, in his commentary on Kena Upanishad manta 1.6 – "That which man does snot comprehend with the mind, that by which, they say, the mind is encompassed, know that to be Brahman", he says, "The mind can think only when it is illumined by the light of the Consciousness". . Svetasvatara Upanishad VI.11– "Hidden in all beings is the non-dual

Effulgent One (Brahman). It is all pervading, is the real nature of all beings ….It resides in all beings. It is the witness of all. It is what makes (the mind) conscious. the lender of consciousness. ("*ceta*" = *cetayita*). Sankaracarya says, in his commentary on Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.iv.2, "(Yajnavalkya addressing Ushasta) 'you asked me to present the Atma as one would a jar etc. I do not do so, because it is impossible. Why is it impossible? Owing to the very nature of the thing. What is that? Its being the witness of vision etc, for the atma is the witness of vision. Vision is of two kinds – ordinary vision and real vision. Ordinary vision is a function of the mind as connected with the eye; it is an act and as such it has a beginning and an end. But the vision that belongs to the Atma is like the heat of the fire; being Its very nature, it has no beginning or end. Because it appears to be connected with the ordinary vision, which is produced and is but a limiting adjunct of it, it is spoken of as the witness, and also as differentiated into witness and vision. The ordinary vision, however, is colored by the objects seen through the eye, and of course has a beginning; it appears to be connected with the eternal vision of the Atma and is but its reflection; it originates and ends, pervaded by the other. Because of this, the eternal vision of the Atma is metaphorically spoken of as the witness, and although eternally seeing, is spoken of as sometimes seeing and sometimes not seeing. But as a matter of fact the vision of the Atma never changes….You cannot know that that pervades knowledge which is the mere function of the intellect.'".Brhadaranyaka UpanishadIII.vii.23– "…….. Mundaka Upanishad II.ii.10 and Kathopanishad II.ii.15 – "There the sun does not shine, nor the moon nor the stars, not to speak of lightning or fire – (i.e., Brahma caitanyam as Sakshi illumines the mind and sense organs by being the source of cidabhasa and through them the world. But nothing in the world or the sense organs or the mind can illumine It, because they themselves are illumined by It. The illumined cannot illumine the illuminator.) It alone is thelight (i.e., It alone is the independent consciousness.) Other lights come after It. It is by Its light alone all else shines. (i.e., Whatever else is sentient or conscious is sentient only because it reflects this real light, that is, the original consciousness. Mind is conscious only because the original consciousness is reflected in it.) Kathopanishad II.ii.13 talks of atma as the conscious

among the conscious. Sankaracarya explains, in his Bhashyam that the words, "among the conscious" refers to the manifesters of consciousness, such as the living creatures beginning with Hiranyagarbha and adds "just as it is owing to the fire that water etc. that are not fire come to be possessed of the power to burn, similarly, the power to manifest consciousness that is seen in others is owing to the consciousness that is the Atma". Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.v.19 – "He transformed Himself in accordance with each form; that form of His is for the sake of making Himself known. (*Roopam roopam pratiroopo babhoova; tadasya roopam praticakshanaaya*" (Sankaracarya's commentary – "The same Lord, in the process of manifesting name and form, 'transformed Himself in accordance with each form'. Why did He come in so many forms? 'That form of His was for the sake of making Himself known' Were name and form not manifested the transcendent nature of this atma as undifferentiated Consciousness would not be known. When, however, name and form are manifested as the body and instruments of knowledge, it is possible to know this nature of the atma.") Kathopanishad II.ii.9 and 10,giving the example of the shapeless fire principle assuming the shape of the different logs of woodthat are being burnt and the air assuming separate forms in accordance with different shapes of different objects, the atma, though the same in all beings, assumes different forms in accordance with each shape (i.e. the different character of different body-mind complexes) (roopam roopam pratiroopah).. The division is not in the original consciousness, but the antahkaranas, the reflecting media, being many, the reflections are also many. Brahadaranyaka II.v.19 – "Paramatma assumes manifold forms on account of Maya" ("*Indro mayaabhih pururoopa iiyate"*. Here, the word, 'Maya' means cidabhasa. In each intellect, there is reflected consciousness. And, through the many reflected consciousnesses, atma appears to be many. Brhadaranyaka IV.iii.7("'Which is the atma?'. 'This infinite entity (Purusha) that is identified with the intellect and is in the midst of the organs, the light within the heart, *hrdayantarjyotih*. Assuming the likeness – i.e., the likeness of the intellect, it moves between two worlds; it thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were'"). within the intellect"), In his commentary, "..'*vijnanamaya*', identified with the intellect; atma is so called because of our

failure to discriminate its association with its limiting adjunct (*upadhi*), the intellect, for it is perceived as associated with the intellect..... 'Within the heart';....heart, here, means the intellect, which has its seat in the heart......The word, 'within' indicates that the atma is different from the modifications of the intellect. Atma is called light, because it is self-effulgent, for, through this light, the self-effulgent atma, this aggregate of body and organs – i.e., the body-mind complex - effulgence of Atma that the body mind complex goes out and works, as if it were sentient, like the shining of a jar placed in the sun .Or likean emerald or any other gem dropped into milk etc imparts its lustre (effulgence) to the milk etc., so does the effulgent atma..... imparts its lustre to the body and organs, including the intellect. .....The intellect being clear (*svacca*) and close to the atma, easily catches the reflection of the atma.....next comes the manas which catches the reflection of the atma through the intellect; and lastly the body through the organs". ......That is why, depending on the degree of discrimination, each one identifies himself with one or other component of the body mind complex......'It thinks as it were'; By illumining the intellect, which does the thinking, atma, through its self-effulgent light that pervades the intellect.....seems to think. ......Hence the people think that the atma thinks but really it does not." Chandogya Upanishad VI.iii.2 – "That Deity (which is the non-dual Existence – Brahman -) envisioned, "Let it be now, by entering into these three Gods, in the form of the jivatma of each individual being....." Sankaracarya, in his Bhashyam, explains, "each jivatma is merely the manifestation of the Deity (Brahma caitanyam.). It arises from the 'contact' of the Deity with the subtle elements like the intellect etc. It is like the reflection of a person, seeming to have entered into a mirror and like the reflection of the sun in water, etc. This becomes the cause of multifarious ideas, such as, 'I am happy', 'I am sorrowful', 'I am ignorant' etc., owing to the non-realization of the true nature of the Deity. Since the Deity has entered merely as a reflection in the form of a jivatma, It does not itself become connected withhappiness, sorrow etc. As a person, the sun, and others enter into a mirror, water etc. merely through their reflections, are not touched by the defects of the mirror, water etc." In his commentary on Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.7 which talks of the atma entering into the created bodies, Sankaracarya, in his commentary poses

an objection, "Since the objects that have been entered into are subject to transmigration, and the Supreme Self is identical with them, It too comes under transmigration. It will also be subject to samsara that we experience". To this, Sankaracarya answers, "the consciousness that experiences samsara is not that of Brahman Itself. Like the reflection of sun in water, the consciousness that is involved in such perceptions as one is happy or miserable is only the reflection of Brahman in the limiting adjuncts (upadhis) like the intellect". Brhadaranyaka 4.3.7says –"He thinks, as it were; He shakes, as it were." (This means that the original consciousness does not itself think, but when the mind thinks, it appears to think. Mind, being inert, cannot think, by itself. So, here also, association of the original consciousness with the mind is envisaged in the form of a reflection). In his commentary on Brhadaranyaka 2.1.19, which deals with sushupti, Sankaracarya says, "The atma caitanyam (*vijnaanamaya atma*) pervades the intellect with a reflection of its own consciousness……..It follows the nature of its limiting adjunct, the intellect, just as a reflection of the moon etc, follows the nature of water and so forth."

1. Yet another important mantra which establishes clearly that there is in the body mind complex a consciousness which is different from Brahma caitanyam is Brhadaranyaka Upanishad mantra II.iv.12 (clarification in mantra 13) where the phrase "na pretya samjna asti" ("there is no longer any consciousness") occurs. In this mantra, in the Yajnavalkya Maitreyi dialogue, Yajnavalkya gives the example of salt water and salt crystals formed out of it. Atma, the original, all pervading consciousness is compared to salt water or the ocean. Here, there is no plurality or individuality; the original consciousness is divisionless;being all pervading, it is also available in the jivatmas. But parts of the salt water can become crystallized on account of heat, and thus acquire individuality. Like that, on account of the presence of the body mind complex, which is compared to the heat, the divisionless consciousness gets reflected in the mind and thus, with a separate reflected consciousness – a particular consciousness - in each

mind, having an individuality of its own, emerges. Thus there is a plurality of ahamkaras, experiencing the world in diverse ways. When the salt crystals are put back in the water, salt again becomes homogenous (divisionless). Like that, when the jnani's sthoola sarira dies and sukshma sarira and karana sarira disintegrate at the time of videhamukti, the particular consciousnessperishes. .The words are, 'there is no longer consciousness' ("na pretya samjna asti"). These words cannot refer to atma caitanyam (brahma caitanyam), because it is eternal; what the jnani attains at the time of videhamukti is oneness with Brahma caitanyam. So, there is no question of the Brahma caitanyam ceasing to be. What ceases, in videhamukti, is the sukshma sarira which includes the ahamkara comprising the antahkarana and the reflected consciousness. It is the ahamkara which is referred as ceasing to be, in videhamukti, when the mantra says "na pretya samjna asti". Therefore the cessation of consciousness that is mentioned in the mantra can only refer to the reflected consciousness, the cidabhasa in the antahkarana with which the jivanmukta was carrying on the day to day activities until the fall of the sthoola sarira.

Section 12 - Significance of Cidabhasa

1. Another question that arises is that if Brahma caitanyam is all pervading, how is it that I do not know want you are thinking and I do not see the movie you are seeing. The answer is that for knowing anything as an object or idea, two things are required. (i) there must be a second entity other than the knower and (ii) a focusing on or exclusive pervasion of a single object or idea at a time by the consciousness involving modification of the consciousness from one configuration to another, corresponding to the objects or ideas coming one after another. Brahman, being non-dual, there is no second entity that It can know. Even if It is taken as the knower, since It is all pervading (sarvagatah), divisionless (nirvikalpa) and changeless (nirvikara), Brahma caitanyam cannot arise as one flash after another to focus on or pervade one particular

object to become a particular configuration after another corresponding to the particular objects. Division and differentiation in the form of a separate reflected consciousness in each antahkarana – multiple secondary consciousnesses as abhasa vada would have it - or conditioning by the individual intellects as avacceda vada would have it or the false notion of reflection in the multiple modes of Maya, the intellects, as pratibimba vada would have it, is necessary for multiple knower –consciousnesses to be formed. Since my knower-consciousness is confined to my intellect and yours to you, I do not know what you are thinking and you do not know what I am thinking. That is why, when the teacher shows the sushupti as an example for us to understand the state of mukti,Brhadaranyaka IV.iii.30, says, "There is not that second thing separate from it that It can know." And, describing videhamukti, when the jnani's sukshma sarira and karana sarira themselves have disintegrated – talking of the paramarthika plane where there is nothing other than Brahman, Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.iv.14 says "What can one see through what?" Chandogya 7.24.1 – "The Infinite is that where one does not see anything else, does not hear anything else, does not know anything else." For Brahman, there is not even knowing transaction (Cf. Mandukya Upanishad mantra 7 – "avyavaharyam"). The vyavaharika prapanca exists only for the vyavaharika jivas. The jnanis among them see it as mithya and the ajnanis see it as real. It is the different minds in different individuals that enable each of us to perceive and think separately about separate things. If a stone is thrown into a pool of water where sun is reflected, that reflection alone is disturbed, not the reflection in other pools. (2). When we refer to Brahman as Sakshi, we are not diluting this proposition in any way. There, we are only reiterating the eternal presence of the all pervading consciousness, with emphasis on Its availability in the individual beings. The knowing of objects and ideas occurs, not at the paramarthika level, but at the lower order of reality, the vyavaharika level. At the vyavaharika level, there is a multiplicity of names and forms and there is division of knower, known and knowing instrument. The

presence of Sakshi serves as the source for the antahkarana to obtain a reflected consciousness. The antahkaranas with their cidabhasas are multiple; each individual being has its own separate antahkarana with cidabhasa in it. Each antahkarana with cidabhasa in it (called ahamkara) focuses on a particular object or idea, separately, and, having the capacity to undergo modification, assumes one configuration after another, corresponding to the objects and ideas coming one after another. This is what is said in the first portion of Brhadaranyaka mantra II.ii.14. Talking of mithya dwaitam, - knower, known and knowing instrument – it says, "when there is duality (dwaitam), as it were, (the words, 'as it were' are significant, because they are the authority for saying that the division of knower, known and knowing instrument is unreal – mithya -) one sees another……. one knows another." If the knowing consciousness was not in the form of separate individual consciousnesses, and if there was only the original consciousness common to all, the objects of the world would all enter the common consciousness, in one jumbled confusion – confusion, space-wise and time-wise. For example, you may see the garbage being dumped in the street in the food you are about to take. You may see a grandfather who died long ago holding the new-born grandson – and so on.

Section 13 - Brahman as Bliss

12. Brahman is described as Sat Cit Ananda. Aananda is translated in English as Bliss. But the word ananda used to define Brahman's nature, does not refer to experiential happiness. It should be equated with anantatvam i.e. infinitude – infinitude not only space wise, but time wise and entity-wise – indicated by the word "anantam' occurring in the Taittiriya Upanishad mantra II.i – " Satyam Jnanam Anantam Brahma". This anantatvam (or poornatvam) is reflected in the pure, calm mind of a Jnani who has identified himself with the infinite Brahman. Having identified himself with Brahman, the infinitude, he can have the sense that he is the infinitude, which is also a sense of utter fulfillment. Such a sense, we can say, is supreme happiness. We

have to distinguish between "swaroopa ananda", ananda as the nature of Brahman and "kosa ananda". Kosa ananda is, as a sense of fulfillment caused by the reflection of the anantatvam aspect of Brahman. It is experienced by all of us when our mind is calm at the interval between the attainment of a desired object and the arising of another desire. The ananda experienced by a jnani is unconditional happiness. i.e., it is not dependent on contact with objects and it has no gradation.; happiness experienced by others is conditional and graded. The word ananda denoting the infinitude of Brahman is used as such in some places in the Upanishads.– Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.ix.28 (7) –"vijnaaanam aanandam Brahma ....paraayanam tishtam aanasya tat vida' ("Knowledge, Bliss, and Brahman ......the supreme goal of him who has realized Brahman and is established in It."- Taittiriya Upanishad 2.41, 2.91 – ".....if one knows the bliss that is Brahman (*aanandam brahmano* vidwaan) Taittiriya Upanishad III.vi.1 – "aananda brahma iti vijanaat" ("He knew Bliss as Brahman"). Taittiriya Upanishad II.v.1– "ananda atma" ("Bliss is Atma" ,i.e., Brahman) Taittiriya Upanishad II.vii – " ko hi eva anyaat kah pranyaat yat esha aakaasa (Brahman) aananda na syaat" ("Who indeed will inhale, who will exhale, if this Bliss be not there in the supreme space within the heart) - Taittiriya UpanishadII.iv.1 and II.ix.1 – "anandam bramano vidwaan na vibheti kadacaneti (kudascaneti}" ("The enlightened man is not afraid of anything after realizing that Bliss that is Brahman") Chandogya VII.xxiii.1 "yo vai bhooma tat sukham" (" The Infinite alone is Bliss"). – Brhadaranyaka IV.iii.32 "Esha brahmalokah....esha asya parama aanandah. Eta anandasya anya bhootani maatram upajivati" ("This is the state of Brahman....This is Its supreme bliss. On a particle of this very bliss other beings live.") Kathopanishad II.ii.14 refers to Brahman as supreme bliss ("paramam sukham."). Kaivalya Upanishad 6 refers to Brahman as consciousness and bliss ("cidaandam ").

1. The ananda, the experiential happiness which a Jnani derives from his sense of utter fulfillment or desirelessness (the state of being without any desire) is brought out in certain places in the Upanishads. In the "Ananda mimamsa" portion in Taittiriya

Upanishad (Chapter II, Valli 2, anuvaka 8 and in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad mantra IV.iii.33),it is equated with the absence of desire for the happiness available in the plane of Hiranyagarbha,which is the highest planeof the vyavaharika satyam. When no object is desired, the mind is calm and quiet; not lacking anything, there is a sense of fulfillment. H ere there is absence of desire for the highest attainable world. So, the sense of fulfillment must be the most intense. In Taittiriya Upanishad Chapter 2, Valli 2, anuvaka 7), the name for Brahman is " rasah". "Rasah", in Sanskrit, in such contexts is the synonym for ananda. The mantra says, "The One described as Self Created (i.e. Unborn) in the previous mantra, is indeed rasah (ananda swaroopam). Attaining that rasah (identifying himself with that ananda, the Brahman)the jivatma becomes anandi (enjoys supreme happiness.) Uninterrupted ananda is obtained by the knowledge 'I am the infinite Brahman'.

2. The logic of saying that Brahman's nature is ananda is contained in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad in the second chapter, fourth section, fifth Mantra. Here, Yajnavalkya tells Maitreyi, his wife (who is such anexpert in Vedic lore that she carries on a long and wonderful debate with her husband who is a Jnani) "Verily the husband is dear (to the wife) not for the sake of the husband, my dear, but it is for her own sake that he is dear. Verily the wife is dear (to the husband) not for the sake of the wife, my dear, but it is for his own sake that she is dear. Verily sons are dear (to parents) not for the sake of the sons, my dear, but it is for the sake of the parents themselves that they are dear. Verily wealth is dear not for the sake of wealth, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that it is dear. ....verily worlds are dear not for the sake of the worlds, my dear, but it is for one's own sake. Verily gods are dearnot for the sake of gods, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Verily beings are dear not for the sake of beings, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. Verily all is dear not for the sake of all, my dear, but it is for one's own sake that all is dear........." The argument is that everyone ultimately loves only oneself and all other love is only because it subserves

the primary love of oneself. And one loves only that which is a source of happiness. So, it is conclude that Atma is the source of happiness and, therefore the nature of Atma is ananda.

13. In his commentary on Brhadaranyaka III.ix.28 (7), Sankaracarya discusses whether the bliss (ananda) of Brahman mentioned in Sruti passages – such as Brhadaranyaka IV.ix.28 (7) Taittiriya III.6, Taittiriya II. 7, Chandogya VII.xxiii.1, IV.iii.22 is an object of cognition. The word, 'ananda' is commonly used to refer to pleasure that is cognized. And the passages cited above would (seem to) fit in if the bliss that is Brahman is an object of cognition. But, since negation of knowing when there is oneness, such as in Brhadaranyaka II.vi.14, II.v.15 – "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the atma, then what should one see and through what?", Chandogya VI.xxiv.1 – "Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else, that is the infinite"...we have to discuss in order to ascertain the true meaning of the ananda passages. The discussion between the opponent, an intermediary and the Advaitin proceeds. Advaitin says, "Absolute separation from body is liberation, and when there is no body, there can be no organs.....there will be no knowledge, there being no body and organs....I it is said that , being of the nature of eternal knowledge-bliss, Brahman cognizes his own nature as bliss eternally, that is not possible. Because, if that is so, a videhamukta would also cognize bliss. But the man under bondage, when freed from relative existence, would regain his real nature as Brahman. He is like a handful of water thrown into a tank. He does not retain a separate existence so as to know the blissful Brahman. Hence to say that the videhamukta knows the blissful atma is meaningless. If, on the other hand, if it is said that the videhamukta, standing different from Brahman knows the bliss of Brahman and the pratyagatma as 'I am ananda-swaroopam', that will contradict the oneness of Brahman and go against all sruti passages. There is no third possibility. If it is said that Brahman ever knows Its own bliss, then it is superfluous to distinguish between awareness and non-awareness. If It is constantly aware of Its bliss, then that is its nature; hence there is no sense in maintaining that it cognizes Its own bliss.

..........Therefore, the text ‘Knowledge Bliss Brahman’ (vij*naanam aanandam brahma*’) must be interpreted as setting forth the nature of Brahman (Brahman’s swaroopam) and not signifying that the atmaananda is cognized.” (In other words, experiential pleasure which is an object of experience and is subject to gradation and arrival and departure is opposed to the aprameyatvam, nirvikaratvam and nityatvam of Brahman. The word ‘ananda’ should therefore be translated as ‘anantam’, infinitude).

Section 14 - Benefit of Identification with Brahman

1. All over the Upanishads, we get statements mentioning the benefit of the knowing, “I am Brahman”. (Some of the statements have been paraphrased, in the light ofSankaracarya’s commentaries). Chandogya Upanishad VII. 1. iii – “I have heard from masters like you that he who knows the Brahman transcends sorrow.” Taittiriya Upanishad II.i.1 “The knower of Brahman attains Brahman. (“Brahmavid apnoti param”). Mundaka Upanishad III.2.ix – “Anyone who knows that supreme Brahman becomes Brahman indeed." ….Heovercomes grief, rises above punya papa; and becoming freed from the knots of the heart (i.e., overcoming self-ignorance), he attains immortality.” Kathopanishad II.ii.12 – “Eternal peace consisting in the blissfulness of the Self is for those who recognize the One God (Paramatma) who, because of his inscrutable power makes by His mere existence one form, His own Self that is homogenous and consists of unalloyed consciousness diverse through the differences in the impure conditions of name and form and who recognize Him as residing in the space of the heart within the body, i.e., as manifested as knowledge in the intellect, like a face appearing to exist in a mirrorand have identified with Parmatma., not for others”. Kathopanishad II.ii.13 – “To those who recognize the Paramatma in their hearts, the eternal among the ephemeral, the indestructible consciousness among the destructible manifesters of consciousness such as the living creatures beginning with Hiranyagarbha accrues eternal peace that is their very Self, not for others.

Kathopanishad I.iii.15 – “One becomes freed from the jaws of death by knowing That (i.e., Brahnan) which is soundless, colorless,undiminishing, and also tasteless, eternal, odorless, without beginning, and without end, distinct from Mahat, and ever constant.” Taittiriya Upanishad II.vii – “whenever an aspirant getsestablished in this unperceivable, bodiless, inexpressible, and unsupported Brahman, he reaches the state of fearlessness.” Svetasvatara Upanishad II.14. –“Knowing the Atma, one becomes non-dual, fulfilled and free of sorrow.” Swesvatara Upanishad II.15 – “when one knows Brahman as Atma, i.e., knows “I am Brahman” (“the original consciousness in me is the infinite Brahman”), the Brahman which is unborn, whose nature is immutable, which is unaffected by avidya and its products and which is effulgent, one becomes freed from all bonds.” Swesvatara Upanishad III.7 – “Knowing that Brahman that is beyond the universe and Hiranyagarbha and is infinite, that is the indweller of all beings, that encompasses the universe, men become immortal.” Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.23 -“This (Brahman described as ‘not this, not this’) is the eternal glory of a knower of Brahman. It neither increases nor decreases through work; therefore one should know the nature of that alone. Knowing it one is not touched by evil action. Therefore he who knows it as such becomes self-controlled, calm, withdrawn into himself, enduring and concentrated and sees the Atma in his own body; he sees all as the Atma. Papa does not overtake him, but he transcends all papa. Papa does not trouble him but he consumes all papas. He becomes free of papa, taintless, free from doubts and a Brahmana, i.e., knower of Brahman.” Swesvatara Upanishad IV.17 - “Benefited by the teaching that negates the universe anddiscriminates between atma and anatma and reveals the unity of Jivatma and Brahman, he who knows that Brahman becomes immortal.” Taittiriya Upanishad II.ix.1 - “He who knows ananda that is Brahman has no fear.” _ Taittiriya Upanishad II.1.i– “Brahman is Existence-Consciousness-Infinity; he who knows that Brahman as existing in the cave-like space of the heart (I/e., mind) (i.e., as the consciousness

behind one's own mind) and thus having identified himself with that infinite Brahman, enjoys, simultaneously, all the desirable things." Chandogya Upanishad VII.xxiv.2 – "The atma is indeed below, the atma is above, the atma is behind, the atma is in the south, the atma is in the north, the atma indeed is all this. Anyone who sees thus, reflects thus, understands thus, revels in the atma, disports in the atma, has union in the atma, and has joy in the atma. He becomes a sovereign. He has freedom of movement in all the worlds' ("..., Evam pasyan evam manvaana evam vijaanan aatmaratih aatamakridah aatmamithunah aatmaanandah sa swaraat bhavati tasya sarvaeshu lokeshu kaamacaarah bhavati". Mundaka III.i.3 – "When the seeker recognizes the effulgent Sakshi as the all pervading Brahman, who, in the form of Iswara, is the creator of the universe, becomes free from punya papa, becomes taintless and attains total identity with Brahman." Mundaka Upanishad II.i.10 – "He who knows this supremely immortal Brahman as existing in the heart destroys, here, the knot of ignorance." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iii.21 – "That is his form (The identity with all is his form); it is the form of atma in which all objects of desire have been attained; hence there is no desire. Desireless, he abides in the atma." ("Tat vaa asya etat aaptakaamam aatmakaamam akaamam roopam." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.12 – "If a man knows Atma (Brahman) as "I am this" then desiring what and for whose sake will be suffer when the body is afflicted?" Sankaracarya's commentary – "If a man.....knows the atma which is his own atma as well as the Paramatma – knows how? – as 'I am this Paramatma', the sakshi of perceptions of all beings, which has been described as 'not this, not this' and so on, than which there is no seer.........knower and is in all beings, and which is by nature eternal, pure consciousness and free, desiring what other thing, of the nature of a result, distinct from his own Self and for whose sake, i.e., for the need of what other person distinct from himself , because he as the atma has nothing to wish for, and there is none other than himself for whose sake he may wish it, he being the atma of all, therefore desiring what and for whose sake will

he suffer in the wake of the body – deviate from his own nature, or become miserable, following the misery created by his limiting adjunct, the body, i.e., imbibe the afflictions of the body? For, this is possible for the man who identifies himself with anatma (that which is not atma, i.e. the body mind complex) and desires things other than atma and struggles and desires something for himself, something else for his son, and a third thing for his wife and so on, goes round the births and deaths and is diseasedwhen his body is diseased. Bur all this is impossible for the man who sees everything as his atma." Kathopanishad II.ii.11 – " Just as the sun which is the eye of the world is not tainted by the ocular and external defects, similarly the Atma that is one in all beings is not tainted by the sorrows of the world, it being transcendental." Sankaracarya's commentary – "People, after having superimposed on the Self (the atma) the false notions (adhyaasa) of action, agent, and the results of action, like the snake falsely perceived on the rope, experience the misery of birth, death etc. consequent on that superimposition; but the atma, though it is the Self (atma) of all, is not tainted by the sorrow of the world arising from false superimposition. Why? (Because It is) outside, i.e., just like the rope vis a vis the snake, it is extraneous to the superimposition of false notion. Prasna Upanishad IV.10 – "He who realizes that shadowless, pure, immutable attains the supreme immutable itself." Kaivalya 9 –"He alone is everything which was in the past , which is in the present and which will be in the future and He alone is eternal. Having recognised Him, one crosses immortality. There is no other means for liberation." Kaivalya Upanishad 10 - "Clearly recognizing oneself to be present in all beings and clearly recognizing all beings in oneself, the seeker attains the supreme Brahman; not by any other means". ("Sarva bhotastam atmaanam sarva bhootani ca aatmani sampasyan brahma paramam yaati na anyena hetuna"). Kaivalya Upanishad 23 – "Recognizing the paramatma for which there is no earth, no water, no fire, no air, no akasa, which is in the cavity of the heart of beings, which is divisionless, and non-dual, which is thee witness of all, and which is beyond

the manifested and the unmanifested , one attains that pure paramatma. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad I.iv.2 – "From a second entity only fear arises." (The gist is that the jnaani has the advantage of fearlessness, in that nothing in the world which is mithya can disturb him who is the satya atma.

Section 15 - Benefit of Knowing That I Am All (Sarvatmabhava)

1. As explained earlier, Sarvatmabhava (the sense that I am all) is without prejudice to the knowledge, "Brahmasatyam jaganmithya" Whereas asangatvam (the sense that I am satyam Brahman, the world is mithya; the mithya world cannot affect me) is paramarthika drshti, sarvatmabhava is a vyavaharika drshti; it is a positive perspective of the all pervading aspect of Brahman… Isavasya Upanishad 6 – "He who sees all beings in the atma and the atma in all beings feels no hatred." ("yastu sarvaani bhootani atmani eva anupasyanti sarvabhooteshu ca atmaanam tato na vijugupsate"). 'Seeing all beings in the atma' refers to the nama roopa and 'seeing atma in all beings 'refers to the adhishtanam, Brahman. n this connection, we can usefully refer to Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.4.vi. "The Brahmana rejects him who knows the Brahmana to be different from the Self. The Kshatriya rejects him who knows the Kshatriya to be different from the Self. Worlds reject him who knows the worlds to be different from the Self. The gods reject him who knows the gods to be different from the Self. Beingsreject him who knows beings to be different from the Self. All reject him who knows all to be different from the Self. This Brahmana, this Kshatriya, these worlds, these gods, these beings and this all are only the Self (one's own atma)" Brhadaranyaka II.iv.6 – "One who views Brahman as if having diversity in It goes from death to death."

Section 16 - Karma is not the Means of Liberation

Knowledge of Identity with Brahman is The Only Means of Liberation.

14. Upanishad statements that knowledge, not karma, is the means of liberation are are as follows: - Kaivalya Upanishad 3 – "It is through renunciation that a few seekers have attained immortality – not through rituals, not through progeny, not through wealth….." (" na karmana na prajayaa na dhanena tyaganaike amrutatvamaanasuh"). Mundaka Upanishad I.2. 7 "….Indeed those who consider karma to be a means for moksha are fools. They enter old age and death again and again." MundakopanishadI.9 – ".....These ritualists do not know the glory of moksha due to their attachment. Consequently these wretched ones fall down when the Punya is exhausted." Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.viii.10 – " He…who in this world, without knowing this Immutable, offers oblations in the fire, performs sacrifices and undergoes austerities even for many thousand years, finds all such acts but perishable; he, O Gargi, who departs from this world without knowing this Immutable, is miserable. But he, O Gargi, who departs from this world after knowing this Immutable, is a knower of Brahman". The same idea is expressed indifferent words in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad I.iv.10 – "Whoever in like manner knows It as, 'I am Brahman', he becomes all this. Even the gods cannot prevail against him, for he becomes their self. Whereas he who worships another god thinking, 'He is one, and I am another does not know. He is like an animal to the gods." Kenopanishad II.4 – "Through knowledge is attained immortality" "(…vidyayaa vindate amrutam"). Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.14 – "Those who know It become immortal" Also cf. Nrsimhapurvatapani Upanishad I.6. Cf. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.19 – "Brahman has to be recognised by the mind alone. ("manasaa eva anudrashtavyah".) Kathopanishad II.i.11 – "This is to be attained by the mind alone. "Taittiriya Upanishad II.2.1 – "The knower of Brahman attains Brahman" ("Brahmavid apnoti param") "The knower of Brahmanbecomes immortal." Kathopanishad II.iii.8 – "Superior to the Unmanifested (Maya) is the Infinite who is……without worldly attributes, knowing Whom a man becomes freed and attains immortality." ("….Yam jnaatva mucyate jantuh…"). Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.7 –

“....that very Atma I regard as Brahman. Knowing Brahman, I am immortal.” (“Tam eva manya aatmanam vidwaan brahma amrutah amrutam.) Brahadaranyaka IV.iv.14 – “Those who know It become immortal”. Mundaka III.ii.9 – “Anyone who knows that supreme Brahman becomes immortal”. Swesvatara Upanishad 2.15 says that the knower of Brahman is released from bondage. Prasna Upanishad IV.10 – “He who knows that shadowledss, bodiless, pure, immutable attains that supreme Immutable itself” Prasna VI.6 – “You should now that Purusha (the infinite) who is worthy to be known ....”Kena II.5 – “The wise ones, having known (Brahman) to be in all beings ....become immortal”. Swetasvatara I.11 – “Knowing Brahman, one becomes.....free from the cycle of births and deaths.” The same mantra talks of the result of meditation, as distinguished from knowledge, as the means of kramamukti. Swetasvatara Upanishad III.7 – “That to which there is nothing superior, which is not limited, which is in every jiva conforming to the body of that jiva, which is non-dual, which encompasses the universe, knowing that parabrahman one becomes immortal”. Swetasvatara Upanishad III.8 and VI.15- “ Knowing that Paramatma that is Pratyagatma, Sakshi, that is the infinite, that is all pervading, that is effulgent........men become immortal. For attaining this Brahman, there is no other means” (“.......na anya panthaa vidyate ayanaaya.”). Kaivalya Upanishad9 - “He alone is everything which is in the past, which is in the present and which will be in the future. Having known Him one crosses mortality. There is no other means for liberation.” (“..... na anya panthaa vimuktaye”). Swetasvatara Upanishad Vi.15- “.........Knowing That one becomes immortal. For moksha, there is no other means (Tameva viditvaa atimrtyumeti; naanyah panthaaa vidyate ayanaaya). “Kaivalya Upanishad 10 – “Clearly recognizing oneself to be present in all beings and clearly recognizing all beings in oneself, the seeker attains the Supreme Brahman, not by any other means”). (.....na anyena hetuna”)..Karma and Upasana involves the attitude that Brahman is different from oneself (*dwaita bhaava*). Brhadaranyaka I.iv.10 says ‘He who thinks that Brahman is one and he is another does not know.”

1. Many philosophers, including even some exponents of Advaita Vedanta and yoga sastra talk of an accomplishment beyond knowledge or a mystic experience or nirvikalpa samadhi in which the mind is stilled (manonaasa takes place) as the ultimate means to realize Brahman. Visishtadvaita and dwaitam philosophers talk of bhakti as the ultimate means of liberation. But, as shown above, Sastra itself says that knowledge of Brahman is the only means of liberation(manasaa eva anudrashtavyah}. Mind is the only instrument available to man to gain knowledge. If the mind is stilled, no knowledge, not to speak of knowledge of Brahman, is possible.

15. Some exponents of Vedanta talk of the necessity of mental repetition of 'ahambrahmasmi' (called *prasankyaayana*), after gaining ahambrahmasmi jnanam. To refute this, Sankaracarya uses Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.1 where Yajnavalkya tells Janaka that by gaining knowledge of Brahman he has attained that which is free from fear, i.e., Brahman; there is no instruction to do prasankyaayana. In Naishkarmyasiddhi II.82, Sureswaracarya says praskhyayana is a mental action and action is not undertaken for attaining something which is already available. Moksha is not a thing that is attained; it is ever one's nature (*nityasiddah*).

Section 17 - Liberation in This Life Itself - Jivanmukti

16. There is more than one place in the Upanishads where there is a clear indication that it is possible to be liberated from samsara in this very life. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.6 – "Being but Brahman he becomes merged in Brahman. (*Brahma eva san brahma aanpoti*"). (This refers to jivanmukti followed by videhamukti.) In this mantra, the Jivanmukta is described as "one without desires (*akaamah*), who is free from desires (*nishkaamah*), whose desires have been fulfilled (*aaptakamah*)and for whom all objects of desire are but the atma (*aatmakamah)*" (His goal was atma and he has attained it. When a person has attained atma, i.e. has gained and assimilated ahambrahmasmi jnanam it is as good as having fulfilled all anaatma desires as well, because atma is the essence of everything. Identified with Brahman he has a sense of

completeness (*poornatvam*0 and is without desires. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.14 – "Being in this very body we have somehow known that Brahman…….Those who know It become immortal," Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.7 – "When all the desires that dwell in his mind are gone, he……….becomes immortal and attains Brahman in this very body. Just as the slough of a snake is cast off and lies in the ant-hill, so does this body lie." Nrsimhapurvatapani Upanishad II.6 talks of the knower of Brahman becoming immortal, here itself.In Kathopanishad 2.3.14, it is said, "when all desires clinging to one's heart fall off, then a mortal becomes immortal (and he) attains Brahman here (i.e. even when he is living.") In 2.3.15, it is said "when all knots of the heart are destroyed, then a man becomes immortal and attains Brahman here (even when he is living)." Mundaka Upanishad 3.2.5 – "Having attained (known) Brahman, the seers become contented with their knowledge, established in identity with paramatma, composes with the senses withdrawn. Having known the all pervasive One everywhere, these discriminating people , ever merged in contemplation enter into the All (at the time of the falling of the body, i.e., they drop the upadhis conjured up by avidya, like space confined within a pot on the breaking of the pot". Jivanmukti is not attainment of any new nature. It is discovery of one's eternal nature. That is why in Chandogya, the guru tells Swetaketu "Thou art That" in the present sense and not in the future tense, "Tat tam bhavishyati". Sankaracarya cites the instance of Rishi Vamadeva. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, citing Rg veda IV.xxvi.1, says, "knowing Brahman, Rishi Vamadeva attained sarvatmabhava". The present participle, says Sankaracarya, is used only when what it indicates is simultaneous with what the main verb indicates. So, knowing Brahman and attaining sarvatmabhava are simultaneous. It means that liberation has been attained in this life itself (even while the rishi was in the womb).

Section 18 - Videhamukti

1. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.4.vi – "Regarding this there is this Mantra verse: 'Being attached, the (transmigrating self) together with its karma attains that on which its subtle body or mind is set. It experiences (in the other world) the karma phalam for

whatever karma it had done in this world. When it is exhausted, it comes again from that world to this world for newkarma. Thus does the person with desires (transmigrate). But in the case of the person who is without desires, (without desires because) for whom all objects of desire have been attained, (attained because has no desires), (he has no desires because) for whom there is no desire other than the atma (identified with the atma, what should one see, hear, think or know and through what?), his organs do not depart. (Since the man who has no desire has no work and therefore his organs (sukshma sarira) have no cause to go to the next world). Being but Brahman, he is merged in Brahman (ya akaamah nishkaamah aaptakaamah aatmakaamah na tasya praana utkraaamanati, brahmaiva san brahma aapyeti)". Kaivalya Upanishad 4 – "Through a life of renunciation, the pure minded seekers clearly grasp the meaning of teaching of Vedanta. Having become one with the Infinite Brahman (while living), all those seekers get totally resolved into Brahman at the time of final death." Mundaka III.ii.4 – "The atma of the knower (of Brahman) merges in the abode that is Brahman". Prasna Upanishad VI.5 – " Just as the these flowing rivers that have the sea as their goal get absorbed on reaching the sea, the sixteen constituents of the all seeing Purusha, i.e., one who has recognizes his identity with Brahman , the one who has Purusha (Brahman) as one's goal, (the sixteen digits being the ten indriyas, the five pranas and the ahamkara) disappear on reaching Purusha (Brahman), when their nama roopa are destroyed and the one (the entity that remains undestroyed) is simply called Purusha (Brahman)". (Depending on the context, the word, "Purusha" refers to jivatma or Iswara or Brahman). Mundaka Upanishad III.ii.7 also indicates that the sukshma sarira and karma sarira of a jivanmukta disintegrate and are dissolved in their cosmic source - ".To their sources return the constituents of the body and to their respective gods go all the presiding deities of the senses". Brhadaranyaka III.ii.11 – "'Yajnavalkya' asked he, 'when this liberated person

(jivanmukta) dies, do his organs go up from him, or do they not?' 'No', replied Yajnavalkya…"".

Section 19 - Kramamukti

1. We get references to kramamukti in Prasna Upanishad V.5 and Swesvatara Upanishad I.11 Prasna 5.5. – "Any one who meditates on the supreme Purusha, using the three letters of Om (as aalambanam, symbol) goes, after death, to the bright Sun-world……He becomes freed from papa and he is led to the world of Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) by the saama mantras. There he sees (gains knowledge of) the supreme Purusha (i.e. Brahman)". After teaching that that by knowing Paramatma all afflictions (klesas) are destroyed and one is liberated from the cycle of births and deaths, Swetasvatara Upanishad I.11 goes on to describe the process of upasana and kramamukti. It says "If one meditates on Parameswara during life, on the fall of the physical body, the sukshma sarira goes to join Iswara (the kaaranabrahma, the macrocosmic causal body, enjoys sarva-aiswarya (all happiness, powers, etc.), and, thereafter, as aaptakaamah (i.e. with a sense of all desires being fulfilled by knowledge of identity with Brahman) becomes Brahman"

Section 20 - Purpose of Teaching about Gods with Attributes

1. The ultimate reality, in Advaita Vedanta is not a principle external to ourselves. It ispure existence, i.e., an eternal all pervading presence without form and without attributes which is also pure consciousness. Or, as gratefulness to Iswara for having provided facilities for gaining jnanam and seeking His grace to retain jnanam, he may use ahamkara, without prejudice to his identification with Brahman, and do namaskara to Iswara." This is the nirguna Brahman (attributeless Brahman). And that is identical with our own consciousness. There is no duality whatsoever. However, with

that as the substratum, there is, as a lower order of reality, as mithya, a superimposition of manifold forms; the combination of the two appearsto us as objects of the world including living beings. This is the vyavaharika plane, as distinguished from the paramarthika plane, where there is no universe at all, not to speak of gods. In the vyavaharika plane, the objects include gods. At the highest level, there is Iswara, the saguna Brahman (Brahman qualified with the attributes of omniscience, omnipotence and all pervasiveness), the creator. Iswara is uncreated (i.e. He is always there, in the vyavaharika plane, without beginning and without end.). Iswara himself, as reflected consciousness in Maya belongs to the vyavaharika plane. When Iswara creates the various constituent parts of the universe, he designates subordinate forms of reflected consciousnesses to preside over them. These are personified as gods. Starting with Hiranyagarbha presiding over the whole cosmos, we have deities like Indra, Agni, Vayu, Varuna etc. presiding over various forces of nature and over the constituent parts of living beings. Aspects of creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe are also personifies as Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha), Vishnu and Siva. Incarnations of Iswara, (called "avataras") like Rama, Krishna etc. are also accepted as phenomena on the vyavaharika plane. Avataras are regarded as Iswara descending in various worlds in various forms and with various manifestations of his powers on critical occasions when restoration of cosmic harmony is called for. The bodies and minds of gods and even avataras are also mithya (vyavaharika satyam.) It is made clear in certain Upanishads that there is only one absolute reality; that is called Brahman, and gods are only manifestations - nama roopa – on the vyavaharika plane. In Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.ix.1 to 9,in the dialogue between Vidagadha and Yajnavalkya, read with Brhadaranyaka Upanishad III.ix.26, it is made clear that the various gods mentioned in Vedas , like Vasus, Rudras, Adityas, Indra, Prajapati, Hiranyagarbha are only manifestations of the one absolute non-dual, attributeless Brahman. To the question, "how many gods are there", the answer starts with 3003

and comes down, step by step to 33, to 6, to 3, to 2, to 1 ½ and finally to one To the question “Which is that one God? the answer is “It is Brahman”. That gods are only nama roopa and the reality is only Brahma caitanyam is brought out in the story in Kenopanishad where the gods think that what was the victory of god is their glory. To disabuse them of this false idea, Brahman appears as a Yakshha. The gods could not make out what it was. One god after another is sent by Indra to find out. Agni goes; the yaksha asks “What power isthere in you”. Agni says “I can burn up all this than is there on the earth”. The Yaksha places a straw in front of Agni. Agni is not able to burn it. Similarly Vayu foes; Vayu is unable to blow the straw away. Then Indra himself goes; when Indra approaches, the Yaksha vanishes. Then Uma appears; Indra asks “What is the yaksha that appeared and vanished?” Uma tells him “It was Brahman”. He long and short of it is that the essence of everything, even of the gods is Brahma caitanyam. But for Brahma caitanyam, gods are also inert. Svetasvatara Upanishad VI. 7 – “He is the ruler of all the rulers; he is the god of all gods…” Mundaka Upanishad II. I. 7– “From him take their origin the numerous gods, the heavenly beings……..” Kaivalya Upanishad 8 - “ He (Brahman) is Brahmaa, he is Siva, he is Indra, He is the imperishable, the supreme majesty, the self-effulgent; He is Vishnu, he is prana, He is time, He is fire, He is the moon.” –Aitereya UpanishadIII.i.3–“This one that is essentially consciousness is Brahmaa (‘a’ with elongated a); he is Indra, he is Prajapati, he is all these gods. And he is the five elements – earth, air, space, water, and fire – and he is all the beings in subtle seed form and all beings born from eggs, wombs, sweat, and the soil, horses, cattle, elephants and human beings. Including all these, whatever there is in this universe, flying beings, those moving on the ground, those that are immoveable – have their existence only in consciousness and everything is functioning in their own field of work or role only by getting the requisite power and knowledge only from that consciousness. That consciousness is the substratum of everything. (Consciousness is the one reality in which all phenomenal things end, just as the

superimposed snake ends in its base, the rope, on the dawn of knowledge.) That consciousness is Brahman.” Mahanarayana Upanishad III.12, talking of Brahman, says that He (Brahman) is Brahmaa (‘a’ elongated), Siva and Indra. Maitri Upanishad 4.5-6) says “devas like agni, vayu and surya are but the body of Brahman”. Taittiriya Upanishad 1.5.1 – “The gods are the limbs of Brahman”. Svetasvatara Upanishad IV.8 – ’All Gods are superimposed on Brahman”. IV. 12 –“Gods are created by the omniscient Creator”. IV.13 -“The creator is the master of the gods”. IV.17 – “The gods are united in Brahman or Iswara, i.e. they are non-different from Brahman or Iswara”. From all this, it is clear that the various gods like Indra, Varuna etc. are merely aspects of the one Iswara and the personification is a symbolic way of expressing Iswara’s powers and functions; the personification is meant for meditation. Iswara himself is mithya. The sole reality is Brahman which is nothing but pure existence-consciousness. . Moreover, even these personifications as Gods,according to Sastra, these so called gods, apart from Iswara, the gods like Indra, Varuna, Agni, Vayu, Surya, Candra etc, are only exalted jivas, i.e., those whose prarabdha karma is sopunya-predominant that they deserve to enjoy life in the higher worlds and are entrusted by Iswara to perform certain delegated functions in the cosmos for the duration of a particular unit in the cycle of creation. When that unit of creation is over, period is over they take rebirth on the earth or lower worlds, depending on the punya-papa proportion of the prarabdha karma assigned for that particular janmas in that unit of creation, unless they attain knowledge of identity with Brahman while they are there in the other world.

17. In regard to Hiranyagarbha, there are two views – one that He is Paramatma Himself and the other that He is also an elevated jiva only – a jiva who, in the previous creation, was an aspirant and being the foremost among those practicing meditation and rites has attained the status of Hiranyagarbha in the current creation. The view is based on Rg. Veda I.clxiv.46 – “They call It Indra, Mitra, Varuna and Fire”, Aitereya Upanishad 3.1.3 – “The Consciousness that is Brahman

is Hiranyagarbha, It is Indra, It is Virat and all these Gods" and Manusmriti X.ii.123 – "Some call It Agni, others Manu and Virat". Mundaka Upanishad I.i.1 talks of Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) as the first-born among the gods and qualifies him as the creator of the universe and protector of the world (Sankaracarya - "He was born independently, unlike other worldly creatures who take birth under the impulsion of punya and papa."). The second view is based on Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.1 speaking of Hiranyagarbha– " …Because he was first and before this whole (band of aspirants) burnt all papa" (Sankaracarya's commentary begins with "it has been explained that one attains the status of Hiranyagarbha through a combination of meditation and rites", Brhadaranyaka 1.4.2 –"He was afraid", Brhadaranyaka 1.4.3 – " He was not at all happy", Swetasvatara 4.12 – "Hiranyagarbha, the first-born" and Manusmriti Xii.50 – " Sages are of the opinion that attainment of oneness with Virat…. Hiranyagarbha……is the highest result produced by satva or pure materials (rites coupled with meditation). In his commentary on Brahadaranyaka 1.4.6, Sankaracarya says, in effect, that different predications are possible depending on the quality of the limiting adjuncts of the consciousness that is paramatma. Hiranyagarbha, possessing limiting adjuncts of extraordinary purity, is described by srutis and smritis mostly as the paramatma and seldom as the transmigrating jivatma gaining the status of Hiranyagarbha. The beauty of it is that all the gods, not excluding Iswara, is unreal. The *ajnaani*, the one who does not know his own real nature worships them as different persons.

18. On analysis, it will be seen that since nirguna Brahman cannot be an object of worship, the purpose of teaching saguna Brahman is only to enable man to go through worship and meditation of saguna Brahman and graduate to jnana yoga (study of Upanishads) and gain knowledge of nirguna Brahman. Cf. Sankaracarya's statement "citta avataara upaaya maatratvena". The infinite Brahman or even the all pervading formless Iswara cannot be visualized. So, in order that devotees may have symbols of their choice for purposes of doing worship (*pooja*) or meditation, scriptures provide various forms, called gods. The spiritual seeker should not regard the gods that they worship as real, vide Kenopanishad 1.5,6,7,8. A

devotee starts the spiritual practice (sadahana) with worship and meditation of a particular form, a particular god, such as Rama, Krishna, etc. But, as emphasized in Kena Upanishad 1.5, 6, 7.8, the gods worshipped by people are unreal. Therefore, the spiritual seeker has to progress further and leaving adherence to a particular form, learn to appreciate the whole universe as the manifestation of Brahman. He must see everything and every being that is glorious as Brahman. This is called viswaroopa-darsanam. But even this also is only a stepping stone. Ultimately he has to dismiss all the gods, not excluding Iswara and the universe itself as unreal, learn to appreciate the nirupaadhika, nirguna Brahman and go on to identify himself with that real Brahman.

2. A jnani has no need of saguna Brahman worship or saguna Brahman meditation, but, as an example to those in the lower stages of spiritual progress, he may do saguna Brahman worship and saguna Brahman meditation. In this, a jnani who has gained knowledge through the teaching of Advaita Vedanta does not make any distinction between gods of one religion and another. He can accept Jesus and Mohamed as he does Rama and Krishna as avataras of Iswara, appearing in the vyavaharika plane and he can happily worship in a church or a mosque as he does in a temple. The idea is that, in religion, meant as the teaching of preparatory, purificatory disciplines that qualify a seeker of liberation for jnana kanda, there can be many paths. But when it comes to philosophy, the Advaita Vedanta devotee will adhere to his faith that the sole reality is nirguna Brahman, the Existence-Consciousness –Infinity andthe ultimate means of liberation is only one and that is identification with nirguna Brahma (jivahbrahma aikyam). Even when the jnani worships in a temple or pray to god, he does so with the knowledge that it is not he (i.e., by identity, the Brahman) but the mithya sariraand the mithya ahamkara that are doing so.

3. The jnani will concede sufficient reality to the world, as vyavaharika satyam, in order to follow dharma but will, at the same time dismiss the world as mithya so that it does not affect him."

Section 21 - Process of Obtaining Knowledge of Identity with Brahman

19. The sadhanaor process for obtaining the knowledge "I am Brahman" consists of "sravanam", "mananam" and"nididhyasanam". Cf. the passage in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.4.5 – "atma vai are drashtavyah srotavyah nididhysasitivyah."

    a) Sravanam is study of sastra by listening to the teaching of a competent teacherwho can interpret the scripture properly, i.e., a teacher belonging to the teacher-student lineage of Vedantic teaching – the guru sishya parampara. Upanishads are full of seeming contradictions and obscurities. The problem is that any part of the upanishadic lore can be subjected to harmonious interpretation only by aperson who knows the whole; since no student will know the whole until he reaches the end of his study, studying by oneself will only end up in confusion or misconceptions. Seeming contradictions and obscure portions can be clarified only through study of commentaries that analyze the purport of the passages in accordance with the rules of harmonious construction called mimamsa. There are countless commentaries and sub-commentaries and explanatory works and there are works containing arguments and counterarguments among philosophers of different schools of thought and only a teacher who has himself studied under a competent teacher in a course covering the original works, the commentaries and important prakarana granthas and works of disputations can convey the purport and meaning of Upanishadic passages. An ideal teacher is a jnani of the gurusishya parampara (the traditional teacher-disciple lineage, a strotriya brahmanishta i.e., one who has himself learnt under a competent teacher belonging to the guru sishya parampara and has himself also acquired the clear and fully assimilated knowledge that he is Brahman. The idea is

that unless he himself has learnt under a competent teacher how can he teach and unless he himself is convinced without any mental reservation that he is Brahman, how can he tell the student sincerely, “Tattvamasi” (“You are Brahman”) to enable the student to be convinced “ aham brahma asmi” (“Í am Brahman”). Since one cannot know whether the teacher one has approached is a brahmanishta (the difficultyis that jnanam is a mental state and only a jnani himself knows whether he is a jnani; no external signs are infallibly reliable to indicate whether one is a jnani.),the best thing is to make sure that the teacher is at least one who has himself learnt under a teacher of the guru-sishya parampara (i.e., a srotriya), hoping that your punya has made you reach a srotriya who is also a brahmanishta. If the student is perfectly endowed with sadhana catushtaya sampatti, sravanam itself should enable him to gain the knowledge ‘ahambrahmasmi’ effectively. But for others, there may be obstacles to the gaining of this knowledge, at the intellectual and emotional levels.

b) Mananam is meant for getting the obstacle at the intellectual level removed. It is the process of getting doubts arising in the course of the study clarified by one’s own cogitation and by discussion with the teacher.

c) Nididhyasanam is meant for getting the obstacle at the emotional level removed. Even after mananam has eradicated intellectual doubts, the habit of emotional identification with the body mind complex (dehaatmabhaava) acquired through the countless past janmas may remain. Nididhyasanam is meant for the destruction of this habit. It is of no use if the mind is able to say, ‘I am Brahman’ when the listening to the guru has taken place, but on reaching home, habitual fixations of the mind take over and one does action and thinks , attributing reality to the body-mind-complex and its relations , such as “ my son has a chronic health problem; I am distressed”, “ I had invested in shares; the stock exchange index has come down; I am dejected”, “ I am becoming old; I am fearful; nobody will look after me”, “ What shall be in my next janma? Shall I be born in a good family? Or shall I become a plan or an animal or an insect?”. “Shall I be

healthy in my next janma or shall I suffer from heart problems and diabetes?" "Why not go and see what heaven is like? Let me find out what Yagna or meditation I should do to go to heaven". "Ice cream is so tasty; I must have it during lunch today". ""T.M Krishna is singing at the Academy. Sanjay is singing at the Millipore Fine Arts. Both are at 5 p.m. I want to listen to both. Why should these sabhas clash like this? In any case I must listen to one of them. The Vedanta class also happens to be at 6 p.m. But I will cut the class today and go to listen to Sanjay". To remove these emotional disturbances (called *vipariita bhaavana*)" which blow away 'the ahambrahmasmi' thought one had in the class, one has to dwell on the various important aspects of the teaching such as - "I am the immortal Brahman. Where is the question of any worry about what I shall be in the next birth or where is the quesstion of going to heaven?". "I am not this body or this mind. No doubt prarabdha is there and the physiological afflictions of the body will be there, but I have placed my ''I" in the pure consciousness. I should not let this mind worry about anything. Let the body go through its prarabdha; this mind which is attuned to the pure consciousness should be calm and reposed". "I am the asanga Brahman. "Wife, children etc. are all nama roopa superimposed on me, the Brahman. Since, in this janma, this particular nama roopa of a body has married that nama roopa called wife and given birth to certain other nama roopa called children, this nama roopa has to discharge its duties to those nama roopa but there is no place for sorrow, worry or anxiety. No doubt as the vyavaharika father, if my son is ill, I have to take him to the hospital and put him under the care of a competent physician. But his condition should not disturb the mind. I have disidentified from the mind. I am saantam Brahman. Whatever happens to my son is prarabdha. Nothing that happens to him should disturb this mind." And so on. Even while experiencing things, transacting with persons and handling situations in the world, the "I am Brahman" thought should be running as a constant undercurrent in the mind and should surface immediately if there is the slightest tendency of intrusion of any notion related to dehaatmabhaava (identification with the body mind complex).

20. In the course of the studyof Sastra, three kinds of doubt have to be overcome.

(a) *Praamaana asambhaavana* – Whether sruti reveals Brahman? This is discussed and the conclusion is that sruti does not reveal Brahman but only removes one's false notion of *abramatvam* (sense of limitation).

(b) *Prameya asambhaavsna* – Whether Sruti teaches advaitam or dwaitam?
This debated by the opponents of advaita and advaitin. The conclusion is that sriti teaches advaitam.

(c) *Pramatru asambhaavana* – How can I,occupying a small corner in a town or village and going through the vicissitudes of life be the infinite Brahman. The conclusion arrived at by nididhyaasanam removing the *vipariita bhaavana* is not only " I am Brahman' but 'I have never been anything other than Brahman'.

1. When we talk of jivabrahma aikyam, it is from the point of view off nirupadhika jiva and nirupadhika Brahman. When we talk of karya-karana-sambandha,it is from the point of view of sopadhikamjiva and sopadhika Brahman.

APPENDIX – EXPLANTORY NOTES

Section 1 - Can Brahman be known

1. A problem faced by the Advaita preceptor is to explain the apparent contradiction between Upanishad passages like Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.9 – It has to be realized only by the mind", Katopanishad II.i.2 – "It is to be attained only by the mind" an d Upanishad passages like Taittiriya Upanishad II.iv.1 – "Words, along with the mind, return, unable to reach Brahman" , Kenopanishad I.6. "That which man does not comprehend with the mind" In fact, Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, IV.iv.19 which says "Through the mind alone It is to be raised" ("manasaa eva anudrashtavyam") is immediately followed by IV.iv.20 says which "It is unknowable" ("etat apramayam")". How we reconcile the apparently contradictory statements is explained below.

   a) One approach is to say that Brahman cannot be known means that Brahman cannot be known as an object but there are methods by which we are made to recognize Brahman. No one will deny that he exists as a conscious being. Initially, one may mistake the mind as one's true nature, but when a constant "I" is invoked as the same entity witnessing the changing conditions of the mind, one recognizes the ultimate sakshi. And "knowing Brahman" means that from the study of Sastra, we have to understand that the sakshi is none other than the Brahma caitanyam. In effect, the Existence and Consciousness aspect of Brahman is self-evident but the Infinity aspect, we have to learn from Sastra. In his commentary on Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.19, Sankaracarya interprets 'manasaa eva' in 'manasaa eva anudrashtavyam' as 'purified by the knowledge of the supreme Truth and in accordance with the instructions of the teacher'. And in his commentary on IV.iv.20, he interprets 'apramayam' as 'Unlike a thing being known by another, Brahman is the One only; hence It is unknowable.' How to recognize Brahman without knowing It as an object is stated in Kenopanishad II.4 – "Being the witness of all cognitions and,

by nature, being nothing but Consciousness, Brahman is indicated by the cognitions themselves, in the midst of cognitions, as pervading all of them. ("Pratibodhaviditam matam"). Kenopanishad 1.4 says that That (Brahman) is different from the known and, again, It is different from the unknown". Sankaracarya explains, "The known is very much within the grasp of the act of knowing, that which is the object of the verb 'to know". Inasmuch as everything is known somewhere, by somebody, all that is manifested ('vyaakrtam' is certainly known. The idea is that Brahman is different from that. But it should be taken to be unknown, the Upanishad says, 'Again, It is different from the unknown'. 'From the unknown' means 'from what is opposed to the known'. The reference is to that which consists of the unmanifested avidya which is the seed of the manifested. (Thus it boils down to Brahman being different from the evolved as well as the unevolved nama roopa).

(b) Another approach is to say that Sastra does not reveal Brahman in positive terms. (there is no *vidhimukha bodhana*). Cf. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad II.iii.6 – "Now, therefore the description (of Brahman) – 'Not this, not this'. Because there is no other and more appropriate description than this 'not this, not this'". Internally, we negate all names and forms like the body, sense organs, the mind and intellect and arrive at the unnegatable pure Consciousness (Cit). Externally we negate all names and forms and arrive at the unnegatable pure Existence (Sat). And we learn from Sastra that Sat is Cit; Cit is Sat and through the Mahavakyas like "Tattvamasi" one owns up one's true nature as "aham brahma asmi". In other words, Mahavakyas do not reveal any new entity. The consciousness available in us, the Atma, is self-evident. What mahavakyas do is to remove the wrong notion that it is limited and equate it with the infinite Brahman.

(c) Elaborating the points made above further, For defining anything in positive terms, there are five methods. (1) If it is an object that is of common experience, when we refer to it by its name, the listener understands what we are talking about. E.g., all of us have experienced the sun. So,

when anybody wants to convey information about the sun, he does so mentioning the name, 'sun' and the listener understands what object he is referring to. This is called definition by 'roodi' or 'dravyam'. Or we can define a thing by its attribute ('guna'). E.g., Jasmine flower can be defined by its fragrance. Or we can define a thing by its function ('kriya') E.g., a knife can be defined by its the work of cutting. Or we can define a thing by the species to which it belongs ('jaati'). E.g., we can define mango as a member of the tree species. Or we can define a thing by its relationship with something else ('sambandha'). E.g., we can define Rama as Dasaratha's son. In the case of Brahman, none of these is of any use, because, according to Sastra, Brahman is not an object of experience ('Brahman is aprameya'), It is attributeless ('nirguna'), It is actionless ('akarta', 'nishkriya') it is one without a second ('advayam') and it is relationless ('asanga').

(d) However, there is one pseudo-positive method. We said that Brahman cannot be defined by relationship, because Brahman is asanga. While this is so, in so far as real relationship is concerned, it is not so, when it comes to a question of unreal relationship. As an unreal relationship between adhishtanam and adhyasa, Brahman can be defined. We can define rope as the adhishtanam of the unreal snake perceived on the rope; we can define the waker's mind as the adhishtanam of the dream world. Similarly Brahman is defined as the adhishtanam of the unreal world – Brahman, the Existence, the satyam, as the substratum of the mithya nama roopa. Asangatvam (Brahman's relationlessness) is not affected because the relationship between the real and the unreal is itself unreal.

(e) In fact, in this connection, there is a debate. The opponent says that if the relationship is unreal, the definition is also unreal. The proponent answers "what does it matter if the definition is unreal as long as it gives knowledge". The opponent asks "if definition is unreal, the knowledge it gives is also unreal; what is the use of unreal knowledge?" The proponent answers, "Because ignorance is unreal, unreal knowledge is adequate to remove unreal ignorance. To cure dream disease, dream medicine will do; in fact, dream medicine alone can cure dream disease.

Samsara is caused by ignorance of Brahmatvam. Moksha is not a real event. One is ever liberated (nitya mukta). What happens is that the false notion that one is limited is negated by the knowledge that one is the infinite Brahman. Both the ignorance of brahmatvam (our nature as Brahman) and the knowledge 'ahambrahmasmi' (jnanam) are antahkarana vrittis and as such are unreal. Unreal knowledge is adequate to remove unreal, ignorance. (Ahambrahmasmi jnanam is unreal but the 'aham brahma' referred to is real; it is the infinite consciousness).

Section 2 - Concept of a Real Creation Negated

1. In Brahma sutra, Vyasacarya points out the fallacies of philosophies which talk of a real creation and of a creator who is only the intelligent cause ("nimitta karanam") of the universe and not the material cause ("upadana karanam") . The main points are –
    - To contact the material, the intelligent cause must have a body and it must be a doer. In that case, it becomes subject to pleasure and pain, desire, hatred etc; in short, it becomes a samsari (transmigrating entity). This is contrary to the notion of God being perfect.
    - Since space, time and matter emerge only when creation takes place, there are certain questions which defy answer. They are as follows:-
        - Where was the creator when he created the world?
        - When did he create?

          (Time and space are part of creation. If you predicate a time and space, prior to creation, there has to be a time and space in which they originated and so on and that will lead to infinite regress).
        - Why did he create?
        - Where was the raw material which constituted his own body?

        - Where was the raw material which he could use to create the universe?
    - Beings appear in the universe with different physical and mental characteristics, finding themselves in different situations, undergoing experiences involving enjoyment and suffering of diverse nature. A creator who creates this diversity will be a partial and cruel creator. Even in a scheme of transmigration with karma of men being responsible for rebirth and enjoyment and suffering, the diversity in the first creation will remain. This is contrary to the concept of a perfect God.
    - If the world and the Jivatma's notion that he is a karta transacting with a real world were real, kartrutvam and the consequent samsara would be inherent and what is inherent cannot go away – which means that there would be no liberation (moksha). Since Sastra teaches moksha as the highest goal in life, it is clear that the world, the jivatma's identification with the body mind complex and his notion of kartrtvam and the consequent samsara are all unreal.
    - If Brahman really transforms into jivas, Brahman will also become a samsaari. and attaining a samsari Brahman would be futile.
    - Advaita Vedanta avoids such problems, by saying that
      (i) there is no real creation or creator
      (ii) Mithya Iswara, Brahma caitanyam reflected in Maya, is the intelligent cause and mithya Maya is the material cause of the mithya universe.
      (iii) the cycle of creation and dissolution, jivas and their karma are beginningless; there is nothing like the first creation or the first karma or the first janma,

iv) the cycle of creation and dissolution is an alternation of Maya evolving and manifesting as diverse nama roopa which include bodies and minds of living beings and resolving into unmanifested condition in Iswara,

(v) the reality is Brahman, who as Existence-Consciousness-Infinity, serves as the substratum for the unevolved as well as the evolved condition of names and forms

(vi) Iswara including Maya is mithya and

(vii) though there is no origination for a jiva and his karma, for any particular jiva, it is possible to be free of the cycle of births and deaths by gaining knowledge of his real nature as the infinite Brahman

2. Gaudapadacarya defines reality as that is ever existent and unreality as that is temporarily existent. Pursuant to his definition, Gaudapadacarya points out that none of the three states – the jagrat, swapna, sushupti – is permanent; when the one is there, the two others are not there. When we are dreaming or in deep sleep state, the world of the waking state is not there. Therefore, the world we experience during the waking stage is also unreal.
3. Aitereya Upanishad I.iii.12 says, "Of Him there are three abodes – three (states) of dream. This one is an abode, this one is an abode, this one is an abode." This Upanishad is referring to all three states of experience of the Paramatma in the empirical (vyaavahaarika) form of jivatma – the waking state (jagrat avastha), dream state (swapna avastha) and deep sleep state (sushupti avastha) as states of dream. This is tantamount to saying that the world of waking experience is as unreal as the world of dream experience.

Section 3 - Significance of videhamukti

Though, for practical purposes, there is no difference between jivanmukti and videhamukti, there is a theoretical difference. A jivanmukta continues to perceive a world through his antahkarana, though it has been falsified by jnanam. But, after videhamukti, that antahkarana is no longer there to perceive the falsified world. The consciousness which has ever been non-different from Brahma caitanyam is no longer appears to be conditioned by the body.

Section 4 - Relationship of Brahman and Maya

Sometimes, it is said that Maya is a peculiar power of Brahman. Even saying "it is a power" is not correct, because power can increase or decrease. If power undergoes change, possessor of power has also to undergo change, but Brahman is changeless. Nor can we say it is a product of Brahman, Because Brahman is neither cause nor effect. We cannot say that it is a state of Brahman, because Brahman does not go from one state to another. It is not possible to say either whether Maya is a part of Brahman or is separate from Brahman. If we say that Maya is a part of Brahman, we are faced with two logical problems. One problem is that Brahman is partless and Maya cannot be accepted to be even a part of Brahman. The other problem is that when a part undergoes change, the whole will also undergo change. Maya does change from the unevolved condition to the evolved differentiated condition of names and forms. So, Brahman will also have to undergo change. This cannot be, because Brahman is changeless. To avoid these problems, if we say that Maya is separate from Brahman, as a real entity, we have to accept two real entities – one, Brahman, two Maya. We cannot accept this, because Brahman is non-dual, i.e., there cannot be a second real entity. So, we say that Maya is "anirvacaniya" (i.e., indefinable) and that it is Mithya (i.e., that Maya is of a lesser order of reality than Brahman.) Once we accept a status of a lesser order of reality for Maya, Brahman's status as the only absolute changeless reality is not affected and the question of Maya being a real power or a real part of Brahman does not arise.

Section 5 - Maya's avarana sakti does not affect Iswara

Iswara is aware that he is Brahman. Avarana sakti is like the cloud that hides the sun from the sight of human beings on earth; the cloud does not affect the sun. Like that, the true nature of human beings i.e., the fact that they are Brahman is hidden by the avarana sakti of Maya from the mental vision of human beings. But since Iswara is himself Maya endowed with the reflection of Brahman, he is not affected by the avarana sakti of Maya. He is like the magician who produces illusory objects and deludes the audience but is himself not deluded.

Vidyaranya gives an ingenious explanation for Jivas being affected by the avarana sakti of Maya and Iswara not being affected. He says Iswara's upadhi is satva guna predominant Maya and Jiva's is rajo and tamo guna predominant Maya. (Upadhi is a technical term for an object which appears to transfer its character to another object that is close by.); Maya gives the false idea to jivas that they are different from Brahman.

Section 6 - Moksha not an event in time

In Mandukya Karika, Gaudapadacarya refutes all philosophers who talk of attainment of Moksha as an event in time. His logic is that whatever has a beginning must have an end. So a moksha that is attained will be temporary. Unless, as Advaita Vedanta says, being beyond samsara is our permanent nature and what is called liberation is only the removal of the wrong notion that one is bound, moksha will be a temporary experience.

One of the examples is the story of the tenth man. Another example is digging of a well. When you dig a well you are not creating space there; space is already there. When you scoop out the mud, you are removing a covering, the false notion that space was not there.

Like that liberation is removal of the covering of avidya, removal of the false notion that I am not the infinite Brahman.

Section 7 - Illustrations for Brahmasatyam jaganmithya

1. Several examples are given in the Sastra to illustrate the juxtaposition of Brahman, the paramarthika satyam, the substratum ("adhistanam") and the superimposed ("adhyasta") mithya world, the vyavaharika satyam – Brahmasatyam jaganmithya. The example often given is clay and pot. Certain similar examples are gold and ornaments, water and waves and wood and furniture. Cf. Chandogya Upanishad- VI.i.4 –'O, good looking one, as by knowing a lump of gold all things made of earth, all things made of earth become known. All transformation is what is initiated by the tongue ands it is name only." Taking clay and pot, let us see what are the similar features which serve to illustrate Brahman and the universe.

   (a) Clay alone is substance. Clay is the substance. Pot shape is not a substance. It is only nama roopa When pot is made, no new substance is created. Pot shape does not occupy any space other than that occupied by clay or add to its mass or weight. Pot has no existence of its own. If clay is spirited away, there will be no pot. Clay is the sub-stratum. Pot is only a shape given to clay and a name by which the shape is distinguished (nama roopa). In this sense clay, the sub-stratum alone is real. The superimposed shape called pot is unreal. Like that Brahman as Existence (though imperceptible), as the sub-stratum (adhishtanam) is the only real entity that is there; the nama roopa superimposed (*adhyastam*) on Brahman are unreal. We experience the clay and the pot shape together. Like that, we experience the real Existence and unreal nama roopa together as the universe.

(b) Pot is evanescent. Clay was there before pot was produced. Clay is there when pot has been produced and clay will still be there when pot is destroyed Clay, the substance, the sub-stratum, remains as clay, whether a pot shape is given to it or a tile shape is given to it. The shapes appear and disappear but clay stays. Like that, Brahman, the Existence, is there for ever ("nityam"). The nama roopa appear and disappear (they are "anityam").

(c) The pot shape is not away from clay. It is there where the clay is. Mithya is not away from its adishtaanam. The locus of mithya is its sub-stratum. So, we say that there is no pot other than clay. The locus of the adhyasta nama roopa is Brahman, the Existence. So, we say that there is no world other than Brahman.

(d) Clay is one. Shapes are many. Clay is one. Pots, jugs etc. are many. Like that, Brahman, the sub-stratum, is one. The superimposed nama roopa are many.

(e) Functional indispensability. The lump of clay cannot hold water. Pot holds water. The sub-stratum without nama roopa is not functional. For transaction, nama roopa are necessary. Thus Brahman is not accessible for transaction ("is avyavahaaryam"). It is the nama roopa with existence borrowed from Brahman that transact with each other. (Bhagavadgita - "guna guneshu vartante".)

(f) Mutual exclusiveness of name and form. Pot and tile or bangle and chain can't coexist in the same entity (pot does not exist in tile; tile does not exist in pot. Bangle does not exist in chain; chain does not exist in bangle) but clay exists as the sub-stratum of pot and tile. Gold exists as the substratum of bangle and chain. Like that, in the mithya universe, the nama roopa are

exclusive of each other, but the sub-stratum, Brahman as existence is common.

(a) No example (*drshtaaantam*) would be similar in all features with that which it is compared (*daarshtaantam*). Clay-pot is a good example to illustrate that the substance is Brahman and the universe of nama roopa that are superimposed are not substances to be counted as second entities, but when it comes to real-unreal relationship ("satya mithya sambandha"), the point becomes arguable, because the example can be construed to illustrate modifying material cause ("parinami upaadaana kaaranam") and the reality of the cause and effect being of the same order of reality. Though not quite like milk turning into curd, clay does undergo some sort of change - a change in shape. Further, the pot maker is of the same order of reality as the clay and has to do work to bring about the change of shape. The plane on which the lump of clay and the shape as pot exist is also the same. Thus, it can be argued that the clay pot example illustrates parinaami upadana kaaranam and the sub-stratum and superimposition being of the same order of reality, unlike Brahman and the nama roopa. Brahman, as Existence, does not undergo any modification when nama roopa are superimposed on It; it is not as if nama roopa were another shape of Brahman, the Existence. Brahman does not superimpose the nama roopa. And Brahman and nama roopa are not of the same order of reality. Therefore, examples other than clay-pot are given in Sastra to show that the sub-stratum and the superimposed name and form belong to different orders of reality.

(b) In semi-darkness, a person mistakes the rope to be snake. Though the snake, as a pratibhasika entity, is actually perceived, there is no real snake there. When another person comes along with a torch and flashes the torch, it is known that what was perceived as a snake is only a rope. Similar examples - A person looking from a distance, sees the sea-shell half-submerged in the sand of the beach and mistakes it to be silver. Though the

silver, as a pratibhaasika entity is actually perceived, there is no real silver there. When he goes there and digs the sand, he discovers that what he mistook to be silver is only a shell. A person dreams and takes the dream world to be a real world existing outise. But when he wakes up, he realizes that there was no such world. Like these, jivas are ignorant of Brahman, the adhishtanam and mistake the perceived nama roopa to be real. But when the guru reveals Brahman and knowledge of Brahman is gained, the world of nama roopa is dismissed as mithya.

(c) When the snake appears, the rope does not undergo any change. It exists only as a sub-stratum for the snake to be superimposed. Like that Brahman does not undergo any change when nama roopa are superimposed. Brahman only serves as the substratum, in Its aspect of existence for nama roopa to be superimposed. So, rope-snake is a goof example for Brahman being vivarta upadana karanam.

(d) The rope is not affected by the snake. The poisonous nature of the snake is not transferred to the rope. The illness contracted by the dream I or the happiness of begetting a child is not transferred to the waker. Like that the good and evil of the world does not affect Brahman.

(e) The snake exists only for the man coming across the rope in semi-darkness. From the point of view of the rope, if we imagine the rope to be sentient, at no time, there is a snake. Like that, the world exists for the jivas. For Brahman, there is no world at all.

2. So, the rope-snake and the dream are often cited as good examples to illustrate the unreality of the world. But, when the light is thrown on the object, the snake disappears; when the man wakes up from sleep, the dream world disappears. But, even

after the knowledge that Brahman alone is satyam and the world is mithya is gained, the jivanmukta continues to perceive a world. Therefore, in Sastra, other examples are given, namely,

(i) the desert and the mirage that is mistaken for water and is negated on reaching the spot but water continues to be perceived in a mirage at a spot a further distance away.

(ii) the rising and setting of the sun, which continue to be perceived as such even after it is known it is not the sun going round the earth but it is the other way about and

(iii) the perception that the earth is flat, which continues even after it is known that the earth is elliptical.

3. Another dissimilarity to be overcome is that for the pot there is an intelligent cause other than the material cause. This problem is solved by the Advaita Vedanta thesis that Maya is the material cause of the universe and Iswara, deriving consciousness as reflected consciousness from Brahma caitanyam, is the intelligent cause.
4. When we talk of nama roopa existing in potential form in Maya and Maya unfolding the nama roopa, clay pot example is useful; all shapes are exist in potential form in clay; the potter only bring out particular shapes.
5. All this has been stated only to show that any example given to illustrate the relationship between Brahman and the universe is only intended to illustrate a few aspects but not all and no example should be stretched beyond a point. Complete concordance between any example and the thing to be illustrated should not be expected; one should only take the aspects pointed out by the teacher who gives the example; the example is not invalidated if it does not fit in other aspects.
6. Mandukya karika is an elaborate and illuminating commentary on Mandukya Upanishad, written by Gaudapadacarya – Sankaracarya's 'paramaguru' – teacher's teacher-, in which the main theme is brahmasatyam jaganmithya. In the karika, in 'alaata saanti prakaranam', Gaudapadacarya gives the example of the firebrand to show the reality and non-dual nature of Brahman and the unreality of the world. When a

firebrand which is a fixed single point of light is rotated and moved in various ways, we perceive varieties of light patterns. We do experience the multiplicity of light patterns but we know that they are not real. Even when the motions take place, the only thing that really exists is the non-dual firebrand. We cannot say where the light patterns originate or where they go when the motion is stopped. It is not as if the various light patterns were produced as entities from the firebrand when the firebrand was set in motion or they were resolved as entities into the firebrand when the motion was stopped. Nor can you say that they came from something outside and went back to something outside. From the firebrand example given by Gaudapadacarya in his Mandukya Karika we learn that just as the different effulgent patterns that appear when the firebrand is rotated or moved in other ways have no independent existence and that what really exists is the single lighted tip of the firebrand, the world does not have real existence and that what really exists is only Brahman. The firebrand is only one but the patterns that appear are many. Like that, on the non-dual Brahman countless objects appear. You cannot say that firebrand is the cause and patterns are the effects. Real cause effect relationship can exist only between objects of the same order of reality. So, you cannot say that Brahman is the cause and the world is a real effect.

7. Another line of approach which Gaudapadacarya adopts in the earlier section in his Karika, the 'vaitathya prakaranam', is to show that like the world that we experience during dreams (the swapna prapanca)), the world that we experience in the waking stage (jagrat prapanca) is also unreal. He wants us to extrapolate our experience of the swapna prapanca to the jagrat prapanca. The dream world that I perceive as external to me is nothing but thoughts in the mind. While I am dreaming, I do experience a world of external objects but when I wake up I know that there was no such world, that the external objects that I experienced were nothing but thoughts passing through my mind. Gaudapadacarya says that just as the swapna prapanca is unreal from the point

of view of the one who has woken up, the jagrat prapanca is unreal from the point of view of one who has understood that the only entity that exists as absolute reality (paramarthika satyam) is Brahman.

Section 8 - Five Definitions of Mithya

2. The first definition - given by Padmapada in Pancadipika

   Falsity is the character of not being the locus of either being or non-being. The falsity is constituted by being different from *sat* (being) and asat (non-being). The example given is the illusory silver perceived on the shell.

3. The second definition - given by Prakasatman in Pancapadika-vivarana

   The falsity of a thing consists in the thing being negated for all three periods of time in the locus in which it appears. (The falsity (mithyaatvam) consists in being the *pratiyogi* (negatum) of a negation (nisheda) which is traikalika (for all three periods of time – past, present and future) in a locus in which it appears. The illusory silver is false in the sense that it is negated for all three periods of time – past, present and future – in the shell in which it is presented as an object of experience.

   This is based on the scriptural text, "There is nothing else whatsoever". The world of multiplicity is eternally negated in the non-dual Brahman which is the locus of the appearance of the world and as such, the world is false.

1. The third definition – this is also given by Prakasatman

   The false is what gets canceled by cognition..This is based on the scriptural text, "The enlightened is freed of names and forms." The illusory snake is false in the sense that it is canceled by the cognition of rope as rope. . The world is false in the sense that it it is canceled by the knowledge kof Brahman.

4. The fourth definition - given by Citsukhacarya in Tattvapradipika

   The falsity of anything positive is its character of its being the *pratiyogin.* (counterpart) of the absolute negation that resides in what appears to be its own substratum. The shell silver is something positive and it is false. Why is it false? It is false because it is eternally negated in the very shell that appears to be its locus. The objects of the world are also false in the same sense. For example, a cloth is a positive object and it appears to reside in the threads which constitute it. But in those very threads the cloth is eternally negated. The cloth is therefore false.

5. The fifth definition - given by Anandabodhacarya in Nyayadipavali.

   What is different from the real (*sat*), i.e., that is, other than the real, is false. According to Advaita Vedanta, Brahman alone is real (*sat*); the objects of the world, like a pot or cloth, are different from Brahman. They are, therefore, false.

Section 9 - A criterion of Mithya

In Gaudapadacarya's Mandukya karika, it is said that one of the criteria for holding that both the external world and the mind is mithya is mutual dependence ("anyonya asrayatvam") which is tantamount to absence of independent existence. The world cannot be proved without the mind. Only when a thing is perceived or inferred on the basis of certain perceptions can we say that a thing exists. So, mind is necessary to predicate the existence of objects. The other way about, if there is no world as object, there is no place for mind as subject. The known is proved by the knower and the knower is proved by the known. This is the mutual dependence which makes us relegate both the mind and the world to the category of mithya.

Section 10 - Mithya not mere imagination

Apropos of mithya, a question that has been discussed in Advaita Vedanta literature, in the context of the example of rope snake to illustrate the unreality of the world is whether there

is actual perception of a snake on a rope or is it just a thought in the mind. It is said that mere imagination of a snake cannot produce fear. Only if the cognition itself is to the effect that there is a snake in front, the person will be frightened. This is the basis for saying that snake is experienced but it is negated when the rope is revealed. Similarly, the question is asked, "Is the dream tiger a perceived object or is it mere imagination. If it was mere imagination, the dream I, confronted with a tiger in the forest would not be frightened. The rope-snake and the dream tiger are said to be mithya of the pratibhasika variety. Like that, the world is also mithya but of the vyavaharika variety. . There is a difference between the snake mithya and the world mithya. Snake disappears when the rope is revealed. But the world continues to be experienced by the jivanmukta even after Brahman is revealed. So, Advaita Vedanta cites the example of mirage, sunrise etc. Even after we know that they are not real, we continue to experience them. Whatever is perceived but is not real is called '*anirvacaniiya*' in Vedanta; it is another term for mithya.

Section 11 - Views of Buddhist Schools about Reality Refuted

1. In Buddhism, there are two branches - Hinayana and Mahayana. There are two schools in the Hinayana branch – Sountraantika and Vaibhashika. Both the schools of Hinayana accept the existence of consciousness as well as a world of objects outside the mind and maintain that any object has only momentary existence. This is called "ubhaya astitva vada". (There is an internal difference, between Sautrantika and Vaibhashika, which is not relevant for the purposes of this discussion. The internal difference is - for the Sautrantika, the acceptance of the existence of a world outside the mind is a matter of perception and for the Vaibhashika, it is a matter of inference.) In the Mahayana also, there are two schools – Yogacara and Madhyamika. Yogacara denies the existence of the world outside the mind but accepts the existence of consciousness. Sautrantika, Vaibhashika and Yogacara – all three – say that consciousness is momentary. (They do not accept any unchanging consciousness.)

That is to say, one cognition arises, exists for just a moment and disappears before the next cognition arises. This doctrine is called “Kshanika Vijnanam”. For the Madhyamika school of Mahayana, reality is nothingness (sunya); So, it is called sunyavada. In effect, there are three main doctrines – (i) “Ubhaya astitva vada” - the doctrine that there is a world of objects having momentary existence, as well as momentary consciousness (ii) “Kshanika vijnanam” - the doctrine that there is no external world at all ; what there is only consciousness and that consciousness is momentary and (iii) “Sunyavada” – the doctrine that reality is nothingness . In Brahmasutra, Vyasacarya and in his Bhashyams, Sankaracarya refute (i) the doctrine that there is no world outside the mind (ii) the doctrine that consciousness is momentary and (iii) the doctrine that reality is nothingness.

2. The Hinayana doctrine that any object in the external world has only momentary existence is refuted as follows:-

   (i) It is contradictory to the Hinayana doctrine of cause –effect relationship (“karya-karana sambandha”). If Hinayana philosophers want to maintain karya karana sambandha, they have to give up the idea of momentary existence of objects or vice versa, because the essential nature of a cause continues to inhere in the effect; for example, clay continues to exist when pot shape is given to a lump of clay and certain chemical elements of milk continue to exist when milk turns into curd.

   (ii) Our experience is – and science also tells us – that matter is never totally destroyed. It only changes from one form into another (law of conservation of energy and matter.)

   (iii) Buddhism also believes in rebirth and the cycle of samsara. And it talks of deliberate destruction (“prasankyayana nirodha”) of samsara by the seeker pursuing certain spiritual practices (“sadhana”). If samsara like everything else has only momentary existence, and will in any case die a natural death, in a moment, where is the question of deliberate destruction through sadhana? So, the doctrine of momentary

existence of objects and the concept of sadhana do not go together.

(iv) If it is said that every object has only momentary existence, it is tantamount to saying that every object is created out of nothing; such creation is contrary to experience. If nothingness is the cause of objects, since cause inheres in effect, we should be experiencing only nothingness everywhere, but we say 'pot is ' , tree is' etc. If nothing is required for producing something, to accomplish a thing, no effort would be needed.

(v) The fact that for growing a mango tree, we sow mango seed and not cocoanut seed proves that a specific material transforms into a specific product. This proves continued existence of an object in a different form, not momentariness.

3. The doctrine of the Yogacara school of Mahayana that there is no external world outside the mind is refuted as follows:-

   (i) Our experience clearly proves the existence of a world outside the mind. If there is only consciousness and there is no external world at all, how is it that cognition is not uniform but varied and differentiated like a tree, river, mountain, a man, an animal and so on and like color, sound, smell etc.

   (ii) In sushupti, we continue to have consciousness but there is no cognition only because contact of sense organs and mind with external objects is severed. The moment we wake up, the contact is revived and there is cognition of external objects.

   (iii) To explain cognition of differentiated objects, the Mahayana philosopher says that what appear as differentiated objects are impurities of kshanika vijnanam. This is countered by pointing out that impurities in a substance are not the same as the substance. Since the only thing that this Mahayana philosopher accepts is kshanika vijnanam, there is no place for anything else such as impurities. Now, he tries to escape by saying that

impurities are also kshanika vijananams. The absurdity of this statement is pointed out by saying that since, in this school, kshanika vijananams are the reality, if impurities are kshanika vijnanams, impurities can never be removed – which means that there is no moksha.

(iv) Unless the existence of a world outside the mind is conceded, how can one explain the distinction between a thought arising from the contact of the mind through the sense organs with an object outside and a mere thought when no external object is present? Sitting in Chennai one thinks of Varanasi. Later, one travels to Varanasi and bathes in the Ganga. One is in office and is thinking that he forgot to tell his wife, before leaving for office, that he was taking her to a cinema in the evening. Later, one comes home and takes one's wife to a theatre. One is wondering why one's friend has not come. Later, the friend comes and one talks to one's friend for half an hour. One imagines how nice it would to have ice cream when it is so hot. In the evening, one goes to the ice cream parlour and takes ice cream. One comes back from a holiday in the Himalayas and returning to Chennai, remembers the cold in the Himalayas while he is walking in the scorching sun in Anna Salai. If there is no external world, how can all this be explained? Even for a jivanmukta, there is an external world outside the mind, on the vyavaharika plane. To this, the Buddhist uses a counter argument and cites the example of the dream which is really only thoughts in the mind but which, nevertheless, are perceived as objects. This is refuted by saying that there is a difference; objects perceived in the dream are known to be false when we wake up but the objects of the waking world are not negated every morning like that. Further, whereas swapna prapanca (the dream world) is nothing but the vasanas within the mind of the particular person and it being

outside is only an illusion and no other person perceives it, jagrat prapanca actually exists outside the mind and the same objects are perceived by all persons. If it is held that jagrat prapanca is also only in the mind, one should be able to say which is the other world the experience of which could produce the vasanas which can be projected by the mind as the jagrat prapanca. For this, there will be no answer. Further how can you explain the distinction between erroneous perception like perception of snake on the rope and right perception of rope as rope? None of the above phenomena can be explained unless the existence of an external world outside the mind is conceded. (In Advaita Vedanta also, in certain formulations, it is said that there is no external world. But, there, the existence of a world outside the mind is not denied. What is pointed out is that there is no world of the same order of reality as Brahman, the paramartika satyam; both the world and the mind are superimpositions on Brahman and are categorized as vyavaharika satyam.)

4. The doctrine of both schools of Hinayana and the Yogacara school of Mahayana that consciousness has only momentary existence (kshanika vijnanam) is refuted as follows:-

   (i) If it is held that consciousness arises, exists for just a moment only and is gone before the next consciousness arises, one cannot explain memory ("smriti"). We remember only what we have experienced. Experience occurs first and recollection thereafter. Only if there is a consciousness that exists continuously from the time of experience up to the time of recollection can the mind connect the past and the present and produce the recollection vritti. That the mind so connects is adequate proof of the existence of a permanent consciousness. Unless the same consciousness which was there

at the time of experience is still there at the time of remembrance, one cannot say that one remembers that one experienced a particular object in terms such as “I remember that I met Devadatta during the festival at the temple.” If there is nothing like a continuous consciousness, remembrance cannot take place.

(ii) If consciousness is momentary, recognition (“pratyabhinja”) cannot take place. The difference between smriti and pratyabhinja is that in smriti, the object experienced is not present at the time of remembrance; in pratyabhinja, the object experienced is present at the time of recognition. Pratyabhinja also proves the continued existence of the subject, besides proving the continued existence of the object. Unless the same consciousness was there at the time of the first experience and is still there at the time of the subsequent experience, one cannot recognize the object experienced previously and being experienced currently to be the same, in t1erms such as “The Devadatta who is now in front of me is the same Devadatta whom I met during the festival at the temple.”

(iii) To this, there is a counter-argument by the Kshanika vijnana adherents. They say that the person you see now or think you see now is not the same person you met or you thought to be there earlier. That person or the thought of that person existed only at that moment. This person or the thought of this person exists only at this moment. You are deluded into thinking that it is the same person or the thought of the same person because the person that existed then or you thought existed then and the person existing now or is thought to be existing now are similar. And they give the example of the flame appearing to be the same, though, at each moment, a separate drop of oil is being burnt and the example of the stream

appearing to be a continuous entity, even though the water molecules that were there at any given point a moment ago have been replaced by another set of molecules already. The Vedantin refutes this by saying that even for recognizing similarity between an object that existed in the past or the mere thought of such an object and an object that exists at present or the thought of such an object, the same consciousness that experienced the object or had the thought of such an object in the past should exist at present. Even if one may say that similarity of objects is possible in rare cases, how can anybody doubt the recognition of oneself as a continuous personality? One says "I who went to bed yesterday and slept soundly am now awake and am talking to my wife about our program of visits this Sunday." Unless the same "I" consciousness that was there when one went to bed yesterday is continuing to exist now when one is awake and talking to one's wife, how can this phenomenon be explained. (The kshanika vijnanam of the Buddhists is the ahamkara of Advaita Vedanta. In Advaita Vedanta, besides ahamkara, which is the changing consciousness, there is atma (sakshi), the unchanging consciousness, invoked as the constant I existing during the changing cognitions of the mind.)

(iv) In Advaita Makarandam, the author uses a graphic argument. A person can never know his own birth or death. One's birth is the last moment of one's prior non-existence. One's death is the first moment of one's posterior non-existence. One is not there to know either. Like that a momentary consciousness cannot know that it is momentary. It is not there when it is born and it is not there when it dies. Another momentary consciousness cannot know it either, because consciousness No.1 dies before consciousness No.2 is born and consciousness No.3 is not yet born when consciousness

No2 dies. So, the question is who is there to know that consciousness is momentary? Unless a continuous consciousness is accepted, the existence of momentary consciousness or a series of momentary consciousnesses that succeed one another cannot be established.

(v). If all that there is momentary consciousness,

(a) there cannot be any notion of means and ends. When the thought of end comes, the thought of means is gone.

(b) There cannot be any notion of possessor and possessed. When the thought of possessed comes, the thought of possessor has gone, and

(c) There cannot be the notion of an article having a name. When the thought of name comes, the thought of the article has gone.

6. Refutation of sunyavada - Commenting on the third sentence of the Chandogya Upanishad mantra VI.ii.1 – "O, good looking one, in the beginning this was Existence alone. One only without a second", Sankaracarya says, "The nihilists (*vainaasikaa*), say that this world, before creation, was non-existence, merely absence of existence. …….Objection: If the idea of the nihilists is that before creation it existed as non-existence, one only, without a second, how can they speak of a connection with time, association with number and non-duality? Vedantin: Quite so. This is not logical for those who accept only absence of existence. And their admission of mere non-existence is illogical also because the existence of the person who denies existence cannot be denied. If it is held that the one who admits (non-existence) exists now but not before creation, then it is not so, because there is no proof of non-existence of Existence before creation. It is illogical to imagine that there was non-existence alone before creation." Vidyaranya also refutes by asking the philosopher who says that there is nothing "You say that

there is nothing. But are you there or not?” He cannot but say “I am”. This is enough to establish that to say that there is nothing is absurd.

(N.B (i) The refutation of Buddhist Schools about Reality described above is based on Sankaracarya's bhashyams. However, in a book, entitled " A Crtical Survey Of Indian Philosophy" by Chanradhar Sharma, a retired University Professor of Philosophy, reprinted first by Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, in 1960 , he has propounded a completely opposite view. Dismissing misconceptions about consciousness and sunya and citing the works of Asanga, Vasubandhu, Asvagosha and Nagarjuna, he has established that Mahayana Buddhism is not different, in essence , from Advaita Vedanta. He has shown that in Mahayana Buddhism., the phenomenal world and the limited intellects are only empirical manifestations related to ignorance and that the ultimate reality is a permanent, immortal. never-changing, non-dual, universal, self-luminous, Pure Consciousness. InTrimsika K., it is said that the Pure Consciousness transcends the intellect and all its categories as well as the plurality of the phenomenal world. It is Pure and Undefiled Existence (anasravo-dhatuh); it is beyond finite thought (acintyah), it is the Good (kusalah), it is the eternal (dhruvah), it is Blissful (sukhah), it is Liberation (vimukti), it is Buddha's Body of Pure Existencce (dharmakaaya).

(ii) In Lankavatara, Buddha himself is said to have described Reality (Tathagatagarbha) to be self-luminous (prakriti-prabhaaswara), absolutely pure (adi-visuddha), to be immanent in all beings (sarva-sattva-dehaantargata), to be immortal (nitya), permanent (dhruva), eternal (saasvata) and blissful (siva)..

(iii) The force behind creation is the beginningless tendency inspired by Ignorance in the Aalaya (Absolute Consciousness) to manifest itself as subject and as object.. The Real Self, says Asanga, is essentially Non-dual. It is beyond Ignorance and beyond intellect. Ego is only an illusion (bhrama). Liberation, therefore is only the destruction of ignorance. (Mahayanasutralankara).

(iv) In certain texts, even the word, "Brahman" is used. Lalitavistara describes Reality as full of Bliss in the beginning, in the middle and the end, One, Full, Pure and the Abode of Brahman.

(v) Though Buddha's teaching was based on Upanishadic philosophy, after Buddha'a death, the Hinayanists misunderstood Buddha's teachings. Proclaiming that the No-soul theory and the theory of Universal Momentariness were the cornerstone of Buddhism, they reduced mind to fleeting ideas and matter to fleeting sensations. The Vaibhashikas and the Sautrantikas said that everything is momentary. Nothing is permanent. Later, Asanga, Vasubandhu, Asvagsha and Nagarjuna brought Buddhism closer to Advaita Vednata. But the Dinnaga school (Swantantra vijnana vadins) reversed the trend and proclaimed that not only are phenomena momentary but they degraded Vasubandhus's permanent Consciousness to the level of a momentary vijaanana or a unique momentary Particuar which they call Svalakshana. But there was no later philosopher who could restore the Reality of Buddhism to the non-fdual, never-changing, permanent Consciousness propounded by Asanga, Vasubandhu, Asvagosha and Nagarjuna. Why Sankaracarya was not aware of the works of these authors is a mystery. (Some of them are now available only in Chinese translations.

(vi) The following extract from "The Concept of Mukti in AdvaitaVedanta" by A..G.Krishna Warrier, University of Madras, also supports Chandradhar Sharma's view:- To a bikku who asked "What is that place where distinctions like water and earth, fire and air have no footting, where long and short, fine and coarse, good and bad or name and form cease absolutely?":, the Buddha answered "It is vinnaana (consciousness) which is signless, infinite, radiant on all sides, where all distinctions cease and where vinnaana (as constituted), after cessation, disappears. (Dighanbikaya and Majjhima). Buddhagosha says that the first vinnaana (vijnaana) is another name for Nirvana while the second is one of the skhandas. (Sumangala Vilasini).(Buddhagosha's interpretation is based on certain Nikaya passages. Speaking of the parinibbaana of Vakkali, the Buddha said that his

vinnaana cannot be localized (apatitthita. (Samyukta and Dhammapada Atthasaalini). Apatitthita vinmnana is explained as consciousness which requires no support for its origin. It is free, steady, happy and fearless.. Thus, according to Buddhagosha, Nirvana is inexpressible and infinite. It is a transcendental state. The Milinda Panha compares Nirvana to aakaasa or samudda, implying that is not annihilation. Like aakaasa, Nirvana is inexpressible, beyond empirical determination (Udaana).

Section 12 - Karma not Means of Moksha

1. In Advaita Vedanta, knowledge (discovery of one's identity with Brahman) is the ultimate means of moksha. Some philosophers talk of karma or upasana as the immediate means of moksha. (Both karma and upasana are action involving motion. Karma is a movement of the body. Upasana is thought which is a movement of the mind). This is refuted by Sankaracarya.
   Sankaracarya's logic is as follows:-

   Moksha is attaining Brahman (i.e. identification with Brahman). The positive result of Karma is only of four types as shown in brackets. Brahman dos not fall in any of these four.

   (a) (Reaching a destination) Brahman is all pervading (sarvagatah); there is, therefore, no question of reaching Brahman.

   (b) (Production. E.g., Seed is sown; crop is produced.) Brahman is ever one's nature. Brahman is unborn and eternal ("aja", "nitya". The question of Brahman or Brahman-ness ("Brahmatvam") being produced does not arise.

(c) (Modification.) Brahman and one's own nature as Brahman are changeless ("nirvikara"); the question of modifying to become We read so many obituaries in the newspapers but our peace of mind is not affected. But it happens to be the death of a close relative, we are sad. Once I understand that I am not this individual body and mind but I am the infinite Brahman, nothing in the vyavaharika world which includes the individual body and mind I am born with will affect me since I have disidentified with them.

2. Another important point, emphasized by Sankaracarya elsewhere is that in karma and upasana, one has to regard the Lord to be different from oneself whereas jnana leading to liberation is discovery of one's identity with Brahman. Karma and upasana are based on dehaatmabhaava, whereas jnanam is destruction of dehatmabhava.

Section 13 - Adhyasa

- The fundamental tenets of Advaita philosophy consist of

(i)Three orders of reality, with Brahman as the Existence-Consciousness-Infinity as the highest order of reality and the substratum, the nama roopa appearing on that substratum as the next lower order of reality, and the dream world and erroneously perceived things like snake on the rope, as the lowest order of reality – paramartikam, vyavaharikam and pratibhasikam, respectively (the latter two which have no independent existence being called mithya)

(ii))Identity of the consciousness of the jivatma and the all pervading consciousness, Brahman,

(iii) Avidya (Maya)

(iv) Iswara and

(v) Adhyasa

- By the avarana sakti of Avidya the awareness of the true nature of Jivatma as Brahman is covered (concealed from the Jivatma). The vikshepa sakti of Avidya misleads the jivatma into regarding the world as real and identifying himself with the body mind complex. This is called adhyasa. Adhyasa is defined as mistaking a thing to be other than what it really is. In the process of adhyasa, jivatma, owing to self-ignorance, superimposes anatma (the body mind complex) and its properties on atma and say, "I am fat" "I shall die soon"(false transference of the characteristic of the body on atma) " I wrote a short story today" (false transference of the doership, the kartrtvam on atma) "I enjoyed my dinner today " (false transference of the enjoyership, the bhoktrtvam on atma) " I am a scholar" (false transference of the intellect on atma) "I am a father", "I am a husband (false transference of the relationship of the body on atma), " my house is leaking" (false transference of the possessorship on atma). So doing, jiva is afflicted by the limitations and tribulations arising from this superimposition. The other way, when one says "I am a conscious being" it is superimposition of the consciousness belonging to atma on anatma.
- 3. Opponents of Advaita Vedanta argue that adhyasa is not possible, because the requirements of adhyasa are not there for superimposition of anatma on Atma to take place. The requirements, they say, are as follows:-

(i) The real object should be perceived in front.

(ii) There must be ignorance of the identity of the real object.

(iii) There must be similarity in features between the real object and the thing that is superimposed.

(iv) The person who is superimposing a thing should have experienced a real member of the superimposed species previously so that the impression left by that experience (*samskaara*) is there in the mind when he is superimposing.

These requirements are not met in the case of Atma anatma superimposition, according to them, as shown below.

(i) Atma is not perceived as an object,

(ii) Since atma is self-evident, the identity of atma is not unknown,

(iii) There is no similarity between atma and anatma, and

(iv) anatma is unreal; so, the question of anyone having experienced a real anatma previously does not arise and, therefore there can be no samskara of the experience of anaatma.

- 4. These objections are countered by Sankaracarya in his adhyasa bhashyam which is an introductory portion of his commentary on Brahma Sutram as follows:-

(i) For adhyasa to take place, it is not essential that the object should be perceived .It is sufficient if the entity is known. Atma is known in the sense the atma is self-evident as the sakshi, (the constant consciousness available for recognition, particularly, in sushupti).

(ii) The condition required for adhyasa is not total ignorance of the identity but part ignorance. We all say, “I am”; that means the existence aspect (sat *amsa*) and the consciousness aspect (*cit amsa*) of atma are known to us. But there is one part that is not known to us; that “I am infinite” is not known to us (the anantatva aspect of atma is not known). (Example. That there is a thing with a particular shape in front is known. But that the thing has the characteristics of a rope is not known. And the characteristics are mistaken to be those of a snake).

(iii) Similarity is not an invariable requirement. There are cases where there is no similarity and still, there is adhyasa, e.g., space is not similar to anything but we do superimpose blueness and a dome like shape on it.

(iv) No doubt samskara of a previous experience is necessary. But it need not be of the experience of a real entity. Even if the samskara is of the experience of a false entity, in the past, it is sufficient to produce the present adhyasa. (Suppose I am familiar with the banyan tree and I have the habit of doing perambulation (*pradakshinam*) of the tree. I go to a village in another region; there I see a tree with leaves similar to those of the banyan tree. I mistake it to be a banyan tree and do pradakshinam. Later I go to another village where there is a tree of the same species. On the basis of the samskara of the previous adhyaasa, I do pradakshinam of this tree also). (The example given in a prakarana grantha called ‘Vicara sagara for the first adhyasa is mistaking a butter tree, *madhuka vrksha,* madhuca latifolia, for a mango tree). For the question how the first adhyasa arose, the answer is that avidya which en genders adhyasa is beginningless (*anaadi*). Another example is samskara arising out of the experience of a *vyavaharika adhyasa* being the basis for a *pratibhasika adhyasa* is - . Suppose a person

sees a ghost in a movie and this *samskara* (retained memory) leads to his perceiving a ghost in his dream. The ghost in the movie is not a real ghost. But the samsakara of having seen that is adequate to create the perception of the dream ghost which is also unreal. Similarly the experience of having perceived a false world previously is sufficient to produce the samskara necessary to produce the current perception of a false world.

- 5. Sastra-based logic for postulating adhyasa is as follows:-

  Upanishads say that atma is asangah, apanipadou, amanah. So atma is akarta and abhokta. But jivatmas identify themselves with the body mind complex and engage themselves in worldly and religious transactions. This cannot happen, unless they are deluded into transferring the kartrutvam, bhoktrutvam etc. belonging to anatma to atma.

Section 14 - Classification Of Adhyasa. Concept of Upaadhi

7. Adhyasa is two-fold. (a) *arthaadhyaasa* and (b) *jnanaadhyaasa*. The appearance of a false object on the substratum of a real object is arthadhyasa. The thought that mistakes the false object to be the real object is jnanadhyasa. The mirage see on the sand is arthadhyasa. The thought in the mind of the traveler in the desert that it is water is jnanadhyasa. In respect of the world, the ajnani has both arthadhyasa and jnanadhyasa. The jnani ceases to have jnanadhyasa and he has only arthadhyasa. The ajnani takes the world to be real and, consequently, he has samsara. The jnani continues to perceive the world but he knows that it is false; therefore he is free of samsara.

1. When you say “I am the doer” or “I am the enjoyer” or “I am the thinker”, you are superimposing ahamkara on atma. This is called “dharmi adhyasa”. When you say “I am angry” you are superimposing an attribute of ahamkara on atma. This is called

"dharma adhyasa". When you say "I am conscious", you are superimposing the 'attribute' of atma on ahamkara. This is also dharmi adhyasa. There cannot be dharma adhyasa involving the superimposition of atma on ahamkara. Because, first, adhishtanam cannot be superimposed on upadhi. Secondly, if you say that atma is myself, it is not error (adhyasa), but jnanam ("ahambrahmasmi" knowledge).

8. There is another classification of adhyasa, connected with the concept of upadhi. The entity which is superimposed on another or en entity the characteristics of which are falsely seen in another is called *upadhi* and the entity on which the superimposition takes place or to which the characteristics appear to have been transferred is called *upahitam*. The adhyasa takes place where the two real entities are close to each other or an unreal entity is located on a real entity. Two kinds of examples are given. One is the closeness of the transparent crystal and the red hibiscus flower. The redness of the flower is falsely transferred to the crystal and the crystal appears to be red. In this case, both the upadhi and upahitam are real entities. This is called *samsarga- adhyasa*. Here, what is mithya is not the upadhi but the relation of the red color of the flower to the crysta*l*. The other example which is more suitable for the case of the superimposition of avidya and the world of plurality on Brahman is the rope and the snake. The snake is superimposed on the rope the rope appears to be poisonous and frightening. Similarly avidya and the differentiated nama roopa are superimposed on Brahman. This is called *swaroopa-adhyasa*. Here, the superimposed entity itself is mithya; the upadhi is unreal and the upahitam is real.

   There is an alternative terminology – *Sopaadhika adhyaasa* and *Nirupaadhika adhyaasa*. Since the superimposition of the red color on the crystal is a false transference from a real upadhi (the red flower), it is called sopadhika adhyasa. Whereas, the superimposition of the snakeness is a false transference from an unreal upadhi, it is called nirupadhika adhyasa. The

superimposition of Maya and nama roopa on Brahman is nirupadhika adhyasa."

9. The very concept of Iswara and jiva is adhyasa. Brahman, qua Brahman, is not the cause, the inner controller, or the witness of the universe, all of which are characteristics of Iswara. Similarly, Brahman is not a cognizer or an agent or an enjoyer; all these characteristics belong to jiva. But the non-dual Brahman, on account of the association with avidya appears in the dual forms of Iswara and jiva. Maya is the upadhi for Brahman to appear as Iswara and Maya's product, the intellects of jivas, are the upadhis for Brahman to appear as jivas. When reality is attributed to the upadhis, Brahman is called *visishta caitanyam* or *visishta Brahman.* When the upadhis are understood to be mithya, Brahman is called *upahita caitnyam* or *upaahita Brahman*. Since the experienced universe is a combination of Brahman as Existence and the superimposed nama roopa, what we experience on the vyavaharika plane, is *sopaadhika Brahman,* whether we make the mistake of taking the world of nama roopa to be real or not. . *Nirupaadhika Brahman* is there only on the paramarthika plane. A day to day example for visishta and upahita is as follows: - I ask you to give me water to drink. You have to bring it in a tumbler. The tumbler is an integral part of your bringing the water. Now, the water is tumbler-visishta. When I drink the water, I swallow only the water, knowing that I am not supposed to swallow the tumbler but I am still holding it. So, at the time of drinking, the water is tumbler-upahita. Upahita caitanyam is experienced even after it is known that the upadhi is mithya, just as you hold the tumbler while drinking water, even after knowing that you can't swallow the tumbler.

Section 15 - Ignorance and Knowledge of Identity with Brahman

Both Operations Of The Intellect

When Brahman is said to be “jnanam” in the mantra, “Satyam jnanam anantam Brahma” the word “jnanam” refers to the eternal consciousness which is Brahman’s nature. It is called “swaroopa jnanam”. It is not swaroopa jnanam that destroys self ignorance. If that was the case, since swaroopa jnanam is eternal, nobody would ever be ignorant. In fact swaroopa jnanam illumines ignorance as well as knowledge, through cidabhasa. What destroys self-ignorance is vritti jnanam, the vritti that I am Brahman. This vritti jnanam (knowledge) is gained by the ahamkara. The notion that I am a limited individual is destroyed by the vritti that I am the infinite Brahman. When I say “I”, if I identify with ahamkara, I am in samsara. If I own up the unchanging infinite consciousness as I, it is moksha. In both cases it is my ahamkara which does the job of identification, but the entities regarded as myself is ahamkara in the former case and Brahman in the second case.

Section 16 - Role Of Mahavakyas

Mahavakyas do not reveal any new entity. The consciousness available in us, Atma, is self-evident – is recognised by us already. What a mahavakyam does is to remove the wrong notion that it is limited. What is revealed by mahavakyas is the Bramatvam status of the already recognised entity. To illustrate this, in Taittiriya bhashyam II.1, Sankaracarya relates the story of a team of ten persons crossing a (dangerous river by swimming). On reaching the other shore the commander wants to check whether all have reached safely. He counts one by one. Engrossed in counting others, he misses counting himself and arrives at nine and he is sad that one of then had got drowned while crossing and wails. A person who is passing by hears the wailing, and being told the reason, counts the members of the team, one by one. He comes to the commander last, and points out ‘You age the tenth man’. In this story, the passer-by is not bringing a tenth man; he is only revealing the tenth-man status to the tenth man. The consciousness in me I have already recognised. What I understand through mahavakyam is that it is infinite. You do not create space. When you are in a room, you may have a wrong notion that space is limited by the walls of the room.

You demolish the walls; you recognize that what you thought was room-limited space is in fact the all pervading space.

Section 17 - Analysis of Mahavakyas

Mahavakyas are sentences containing words which are in *saamaanaaadhikaranya*, i.e., all the words in the sentence, being grammatically in the same case, point to the same entity, though each has a different significance. There are three main methods of analyzing the samanadhikaranyam of the wordsa in the mahavakyas. The method of analyzing the mahavakya "Tattvamasi" occurring Chandogya Upanishad is called *jahallajahallakshanaa* or *bhaagatyaagalakshanaa*. The literal meaning (*vacyaartha*) is 'jivatma' consisting of ahamkara (antahkaranam plus cidabhasa) which has limited knowledge (*alpajnatbvam)* and limited powers (*alpasaktimatam*) and the original consciousness. The vacyartha of 'Tat' is Iswara, consisting of reflected consciousness in Maya with omniscience (*sarvajnatvam*) and omnipotence (*sarvasaktimavam*) and the original consciousness. The word, 'asi' says that the two are identical. The question is, 'how can we equate the jivatma, the one with limited knowledge and limited powers with Iswara, the one with unlimited knowledge and unlimited powers. So, we give up the vacyartha and take recourse to the implied meaning (*lakshaartha*) of 'tat' and 'tvam'. In doing so, we discard the mithya parts of the word 'tvam', viz., the ahamkara and retain the satya part , viz., the original consciousness. Similarly, wde discard the mithya part of the word 'tat', viz., Maya and the reflected consciousness and retain the original consciousness. And the original consciousness part of 'tvam' is equated with the original consciousness part of 'tat' by the word.'asi'. Thus 'tat' and 'tvam' are understoofd as being identical. Since we discard one part of the meaning and retain the other part in the words. 'tvam' amd 'tat', this is called jahallajahallakshana or bhagatyagalakshana. (This bhagatyagalakshana method is what is adopted in Sankaracarya's Vakyavritti verses 44 - 48). (In "tattvamasi, the word "tat" juxtaposed with the word "tvam" negates the limitation of jivatma and the word "tvam"

juxtaposed with the word “tat” negates the remoteness of paramatma.) Similarly, in the mahavakyas “aham brahmasmi” (Brahadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10, 2.5.19), “prajnaanam brahma” (Aitereya Upanishad 3.1.3) and “ayamaatma brahma” (Mandukya Upanishad 2), the vacyartha of the words “aham”, “prajnaanam” and “ayamatma” is jiva and the vacyartha of the word “brahma” is Iswara. So, in these cases also, we have to apply jahal-ajahal-lakshanaa (bhagatyagalakshanaa), discard the mithya portion, the ahamkara in jiva and the reflected consciousness and Maya in Iswara and adopt the lakshysartha and equate the pure consciousness portions. In some cases, it is necessary to substitute, for an entire word, an associated meaning. The example is “sarvam khalu idam Brahma” (“the world is Brahman” and “*idam sarvam yadayam atma*”) The world of nama roopas is mithya How can the mithya world be equated with satya Brahman? So, we discard the word, ‘world’ entirely and substitute for it, as an associated word, viz., the subs-stratum, ‘Existence’. Existence is Brahman. So, the equation becomes valid. Here, since one of the words in the sentence is discarded entirely, the method is called jahallakshana. Where the vacyartha or lakshyartha of two or more words of the equation is the same, it is called *aikyasaamanaadhikaranyam*. Where one or more of the words of the equation have to be discarded, it is called *bhadhaayaasaamanaadhikaranyam*. (‘Tattvamasi’ occurs in Chandogya Upanishad 6h chapter where section 2 begins with the words, ‘…in the beginning this was Existence alone, One only, without a second’. So, the question is, why are we taking the vacyartha of ‘tat’ to be Iswara and not Brahman. The answer is that immediately after section 2, section 3 says “That visualized, ‘I shall become many. I shall be born’. That created fire….” and, thus goes on to describe creation. So, the vacyartha of ‘tat’ which occurs in VI.viii.7 onwards is taken to be Iswara. Similarly, in sections 5 and 6 of Chapter 6, the body and mind produced from food is described and in 6 3.3 , the entry of Parmatma in the form of jivatma is mentioned. . So, the vacyartha of ‘tvam’ is taken as jivatma.)

(Other types of samanadhikaranyam are – karya-kaarana-saamanaadhikaranyam, e.g. clay pot, amsa-amsi-saamanaadhikaranyam, e.g. desert land, guna-guni-bhaava-saamnaadhikaranyam (viseshana-vishishya-bhava-s.), e.g. blue lily and jaati-vyakti-bhava-saamaanadhikaranya, e.g. mango tree.)

Section 18 - Moksha Means Knowing One's Infinite Nature

Brahman is said to be infinite, space wise, time wise and entity wise. When you talk of a thing that is attained by you, it has to be a finite thing; before attaining it, it has to be away from you. Conversely, there can be no such event as attaining the thing that is infinite. By definition, 'the infinite' precludes the existence of any second entity. So, to talk of your being away from the infinite, to start with, and your attaining it, later, is illogical. Therefore, 'attainment of Brahman' can only be a figure of speech. One is ever Brahman; one has been ignorant of this fact and the ignorance is removed through study of Sastra. In short, only if you are infinite yourself you can discover your infinite nature**.** Transformation from finite to another finite is useless. Transformation from infinite to infinite is not necessary. Transformation from finite to infinite is not possible. Only if we are already infinite but are ignorant of it can we discover our infinity.

Section 19 - Importance of "asi" in "Tattvamasi"

By knowing the meaning of the word, "Tvam" ("Thou") or "Tat ("That") alone, you do not attain liberation. By enquiry into the true meaning of "Tvam", you may understand that you are not the body or the mind but the unchanging consciousness available to be invoked as the constant "I" in and through the changing conditions of the body and mind. That is not enough. Because you may think that there are as many consciousnesses as there are bodies and minds. Similarly by enquiry into the true meaning of Tat, you may know that Brahman is the infinite Existence-Consciousness-Infinity, the only reality, the sub-stratum of all false

manifestations, but what benefit is there for you in it? Only when the meaning of "Tvam" and "Tat" are tied by "asi" and when the teacher says "Tat tvam asi", you understand "aham brahma asmi (I am that Brahman), then alone you are free from samsara.

Section 20 – The meaning of Self-Effulgence

It is said that atma is self-effulgent (swayam-prakaasa). "Self-effulgence" means 'self evident' – an objectifying instrument of knowledge (pramana) is not required for it to be recognized as existing. In Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya Vartikam, Chapter II, verse 681), Sureswacarya explains this. There are only three possibilities for atma to be known by another agency. (1) Through anatma. This is not possible because anatma is insentient. (2) Through atma itself. This is not possible because one and the same entity cannot be the knower and the known. (3) Through another consciousness. This is not possible, because there is no other consciousness. (Cidabhasa cannot objectify atma because cidabhasa itself is a reflection of atma caitanyam; the reflection cannot illumine the original).

An opponent argues "If Brahman is not known It should be treated as unknown. This rules out the possibility of attaining the knowledge of Brahman and leads to the futility of sastra." To this, Sureswacarya answers, "This argument is untenable. Brahman is both known and unknown. Brahman is none other than pratyagatma and pratyagatma is always immediate (aparoksha). In this sense, Brahman is known. But only through sastra that one gets the knowledge that Brahman is identical with pratyagatma. In this sense, (but for sastra) Brahman is unknown.

Section 21 - Translation of "Satyam"

In "Satyam Jnanam Anantam Brahma" As Existence

In the main paper, The Taittiriya Upanishad definition of *Brahman* in 2.1.1 "*Satyam Jnaanam Anantam Brahma*" has been translated as "Existence-Consciousness-Infinity". The logic of this translation is as follows: -

Translated literally, the English word "Truth" would not convey the intended meaning. In his commentary on Taittiriya 2.1.1, Sankaracarya explains that a thing is said to be "satyam" (true) when it does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own (and a thing is said to be unreal if it changes the nature ascertained to be its own).. From this it follows that the word "truth" implies changelessness. In his commentary on Taittiriya 2.6.1, Sankaracarya says, "Apropos of this, existence is first being spoken of. It remains to be explained as to what kind of truth is meant in the assertion that was made thus: 'Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinitude'. Hence it is being said: Brahman's truth is affirmed by speaking of Its existence; for it has been asserted that the existing is the true (cf. Chandogya 6.2.1). Therefore the very affirmation of existence amounts to an avowal of reality." In his commentary on Taittiriya 2.1.1, he says, "'pure existence is Truth, according to another Vedic text." The other Vedic text referred to is Chandogya 6.8.7. Commenting on Chandogya 6.8.7, Sankaracarya explains that "the word 'That' refers to what has been spoken of as existence. The commentary on 6 8.7 goes on to say "That which has been spoken of as Existence is the subtle essence of the universe, the source of the whole universe. All this has got this existence as their self.... This whole universe has become possessed of a self through this atma, which is called Existence....... And the atma through which this entire universe has becomes possessed of its self (existence) that itself is the source called Existence, the Truth, the Supreme Reality. Hence that indeed is the self of the world, its inmost essence, its quintessence, its very reality." And, in his commentary on the Chandogya Upanishad passage 6.2.1 Sankaracarya explaining the word "sadeva" says, "The word 'sat' means mere Existence" and goes on to describe it as a thing that is subtle, without distinction, all pervasive, one, taintless, partless consciousness which is known

from all Upanishads." Further, he says," That which is this universe which is perceived as a modification possessed of name, form and movement that was Existence alone," Thus, he equates "Truth" and "Pure existence." This is the logic of translating "Satyam" in Taittiriya 2.1.1 as "Existence .

Section 22 - Deriving One Definition of Brahman from Another

From one item of the definition of Brahman, we can derive other items. (Most of these are specifically there in the Upanishads. But, here, we are just indicating the inter-connections. For example, Brahman is said to be non-dual ("*advayam*"). Only if there is a second entity can there is a relationship. So "Brahman is "*asanga*" is a corollary. (Sruti specifically says that atma is *asanga* - Brhadaranyaka 4.3.15, 3.8.8, 3.9.26, 4.2.4, 4.4.22, 4.5.15. "*Asanga*" means it cannot have any relation or transaction with anybody or anything. (Mandukya 7 – "*avyavahaaryam*) and it cannot be doer or enjoyer (cannot be"*karta*" or "*bhokta*" vide Kathopanishad 1.2.19, Swetasvatara 6.12, 6.19). Also being *asanga* (relationless) means It is neither cause nor effect, because to be cause is to have relation with effect and to be effect is to have relation with cause. When Upanishad says that Brahman is eternal (nityam*),* that it is not born nor does it die and that it is not born from anything nor is anything born from it, it not only means that It is neither cause nor effect, but it means that It has no beginning or end. (It is "*anaadi*" and "*anantah*"). That which has no beginning and has no end impels that it remains the same and is free from other intermediary changes also. So, changelessness of Brahman is also derived. Changelessness also implies that It is neither cause nor effect ("*kaaryaakaaranavilakshana"*), because cause has to undergo change to become effect and an effect is one that has an end. Changelessness also implies that Brahman is beyond time and space, because change is takes place in space and is an event in time. Brahman (Aatma) is said to be all pervading ("*sarvagatah*", "*sarvaga*"

(“*sarvavyaapi*”) .Mundaka 1.1.6, 3.2.5, 5, Swetasvatara 1.16, 3.11, 3.21, 6.13, 6.17) and formless (*amoorthah*) (Mundaka Upanishad 2.1.2, Maitri Upanishad 6.3, 7.1,2).. Change is event in time and takes place for an entity with form, that is, with boundaries, located in space. So, changelessness is derived from all pervasiveness also. Brahman is the support (*adhishtaanam*) of not only the objects of the world but of time and space which is part of nama roopa and is infinite,-. So, the corollary is that Brahman is beyond tine and space. Cf. Swetasvatara 6.2 - Creator of time (“*kaalakaarah*”); Brhadaranyaka 4.4.16 – “the Lord…….below which the year itself rotates”; ‘Kathopanishad 1.2.14 – “…that thing which is different from the past and the present”; Kathopanishad 2.1.13 “He is the ruler of the past and the future” (These refer to time-wise transcendence). Swetasvatara 3.14 (which, it seems, reproduces Taittiriya Aranyaka third Prasna) reads, “.” “With thousand heads and thousand feet and having enclosed the universe, the Purusha (the Infinite) stands ten inches beyond.” (This refers to space-wise transcendence. When Brahman is said to be all pervading, we have to understand it properly. It is not as if there was already a universe and Brahman pervaded it. Brahman is the eternal Existence. And on that Existence names and forms are superimposed in an alternating cycle of manifested and unmanifested condition. It is like space which is already there and you insert perceptible objects in it. So, the corollary is that atma is beyond time and space. Also, Taittiriya Upanishad 2.1 and Swetasvatara 1.9, 5.1, say that Brahman is infinite (“*anantam*”). (The word, “Brahman” itself means unsurpassably big. Only that which has no limits, i.e., only the infinite can be said to be unsurpassably big.) The infinitude applies to space, time and entity, as Sankaracarya points out in Taittiriya bhashayam 2.1. From this also, we have to understand that Brahman is beyond time and space and other entities. From infinity time wise, also, we can go to eternality of Brahman (*nityatvam*) and beginningless and endlessness of Brahman (*anaaditvam and antaraahityam) and* vice versa. Similarly, from infinity space wise, we can infer formlesness (*niraakaaratvam*) and all pervasiveness (*sarvagatatvam)* and from infinity entity wise, we can infer non-duality -, there can be no other real entity).

There can be only one infinite. 'Many infinite things' is a contradiction in terms. Since there can be so other real entity, the world has to be of a lower order of reality. So, Brahman defined as satyam (Existence) and jnanam (Consciousness) as also anantam (infinitude) means that the existence nature and consciousness nature of Brahman is all pervasive, eternal and non-dual. Any finite entity will be one that is attained in time or is yet to be attained. The infinite cannot be attained by the finite. Brahman, being infinite, we cannot attain Brahman unless we ourselves are infinite. There can be no two infinite entities; if such proposition is put forward, the one will limit the other; so both will become finite. So when it is said that Brahman is infinite and jivatma is infinite, as in the santipatha, 'Poornamada poornamaidam' jivatma in its real nature has to be ever identical with paramatma. That is why Brahman is called "*siddha vastu*" (that which is already attained) and not *sadhya vastu* (that which is to be attained). To have attributes is to be limited. What is big is not small. What is love is not hatred. So, when Brahman is said to be infinite, it follows that Brahman is without attributes ('*nirguna*"); Svetasvatara Upanishad 6.11 and Brahma Upanishad 3 specify that Brahman is nirguna. To have attributes is to be subject to change. Brahman which is without attributes ("*nirguna*") will therefore be changeless. "Nirguna' includes 'devoid of form'; being devoid of form is all pervading.

Section 23 - Description of Brahman in terms of contradiction.

1. We come across apparently contradictory or intriguing passages in the Upanishads. These have to be interpreted, taking into account relevant passages where the meaning is clear. Kenopanishad 1.4 – "That (Brahman) is surely different from the known; and again It is above the unknown" Sankaracarya explains, "Inasmuch as everything is known somewhere by somebody, all that is manifested is certainly known. The idea is that Brahman is different from that (the manifested universe). The unknown is opposed to the

known. This consists of the unmanifested in the form of avidya, which is the seed of the manifested. Brahman is different from that also. (In short, Brahman is different from the projected nama roopa as well as from Maya). Further, what is known is finite, mortal and full of misery; and hence it is to be rejected. So, when it is said that Brahman is different from the known, it amounts to saying that Brahman is not to be rejected. Similarly when it is said that Brahman is different from the unknown, it amounts to saying that Brahman is not en entity to be obtained. In the '*vakyabhashyam*' for this mantra, Sankaracarya says, "Since Brahman is the atma of all, there is no other knower than It; so, It is different from the known. Cf. Swetasvatara Upanishad 2.19 – 'He (the Purusha i.e., Brahman) knows al that is to b e known. There is no one who knows Him'. Brhadaranyaka 2.4.14 – 'When to the knower of the atma, everything has become the atma ….what one should know through what'. Brahman is different from the unknown because, to know an unknown thing, effort to know is undertaken by people. But Brahman is of the nature of consciousness (vijnaana-*swaroopam*) and self-evident and no process of knowing is necessary to know (recognize) Brahman. In this sense, Brahman is different from the unknown. Just as the light does not depend on any other light to be revealed, Brahman being of the very nature of consciousness is self-evident and does not depend any instrument or process of knowledge to be revealed. Kenopanishad II.2 (where the teacher is testing whether the student has understood the teaching and the student says) - "Not that I do not know. I know and I do not know as well. He among us who understands that utterance 'not that I do not know, I know and I do not know as well', knows that (Brahman)". This, Sankaracarya says is the student repeating in another language the meaning of mantra 1.4 which has been taught to him. In the vakyabhashyam, Sankaracarya explains the student's statement: – "I cannot say that I do not know Brahman because I am the Brahman of the nature of eternal jnana swaroopam (*nitya-vijnaana—brahma-swaroopam*)   So, I know. On the other hand, I do not know, because knowing as an attributive knowledge (*visesha-vijnaanam*) is knowing a

second entity that is conjured up, not one's swaroopam. Therefore, in the paramarthika plane, I do not know.

2. Kenopanishad II.3 - "It is known to him to whom it is unknown; he does not know it is known. It is unknown to those who know well and known to those who do not know." According to Sankaracarya, this mantra presents the two views – the view of the ignorant man and the man who has gained knowledge. In the vakyabhashyam, Sankaracarya explains– "He who has come to know Brahman as himself and, so, his desire to know has ceased, he knows Brahman. That is, he who knows Brahman as being not an object of knowledge but as himself, he is the one who knows Brahman. Since Brahman is different from the known, one who claims that he knows Brahman does not know Brahman. The former is the man of right vision (*samyagdarsi*); the latter is a man of erroneous vision (*mithyaarsi*). The erroneous vision is possible because on account of non-discrimination between Brahman and the limiting adjuncts and because of their familiarity with the limiting adjuncts such as the intellect, the man of erroneous vision considers the senses, the mind and the intellect as the atma. Kenopanishad II.4 - "Brahman is really known when it is known with each state of consciousness (*pratibodhaviditam*)." Sankaracarya's commentary – "Being the witness of all cognitions and by nature being nothing but the power of Consciousness, the atma is indicated by the cognitions themselves, as the common factor in the cognitions. There is no other door to awareness of It. Therefore when Brahman is known as the innermost Self (witness) of cognitions, then it is known well. Only by accepting Brahman as the witness of all cognitions can it be established that It is by nature a witness that is not subject to growth and decay, and is eternal, pure in essence, the atma, unconditioned, and one in all beings, just as it is in the case of space, because of the non-difference of its characteristics despite its existence in pots, caves etc." In the vakyabhashyam, Sankaracarya explains, "In every cognition', i.e. in cognition after cognition' refers to the pervasion (of Brahman) in every cognition. Since every cognition is

pervaded by the eternal consciousness, the atma, every thought is illumined by that atma, like the shining of the iron ingot pervaded by the fire. Like that, through the shining of the thoughts, one should recognize the illumination by the atma. (The gist of all these Kenopanishad mantras is that atma cannot be known as an object but It has to be recognized as the witness of thoughts. When it is said that Brahman or Atma is the consciousness recognized as the witness of all cognitions, we should not make the mistake of taking the atma to be a knower-consciousness It is witness in the sense that, in its presence, the antahkarana becomes sentient on account of Its reflection and whereas the knower consciousness, the knower I, is a changing I, the atma is invoked as the unchanging, constant I.)

3. Katopanishad mantra I.ii.21 says, "While sitting, It goes far away; while sleeping, it goes everywhere". Sankaracarya explains, "Sleep is the cessation of the activities of the senses. The delimitation of Consciousness caused by the senses (in the waking state, when Consciousness has such limited expressions as, "I am a man', 'I see a blue thing') ceases for a sleeping man. When the Self is in such a state (of sleep), It seems to go (i.e. to be present) everywhere. When it is in a state of particularized consciousness, It, though stationary by Its on nature, seems to travel far, in accordance with the movement of the mind etc., because it is conditioned by the mind etc." In short, the when the mantra talks of it being stationary, It is referring to the sarvagata nirupadhika Brahma caitanyam and when it refers to It traveling far, It is referring to the ahamkara which includes the reflection of the brahma caitanyam.

4. Isavasya Upanishad 4 – "It is unmoving, one, faster than the mind" ((Sankaracarya's commentary – "Motion is deviation from one's own condition. So, 'unmoving' means that It is ever of the same nature; It is the everlasting Consciousness. 'One' indicates that It is the one in all beings. ;. Faster than the mind' refers to its being characterized by volition etc." An objection is raised "How can there be such contradictory statements that it is

constant and motionless, and yet faster than the mind." Sankaracarya explains "There is no inconsistency, for this is possible from the standpoint of Its being nirupadhika and sopadhika. As nirupadhika Brahman, in Its original nature, It is spoken of as 'unmoving, one'. When It follows the upadhi, the mind characterized by doubt and volition It is said to be faster than the mind. The mind, though encased in the body in this world, is able to reach such distances as the world of Brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) in a single moment through volition; and therefore the mind is well known as the fastest thing in the world. When the speedy mind travels fast to the world world of Hiranyagarbha etc., the reflection of the atma that is consciousness is perceived to have reached there, as it were, even earlier; and hence It is said to be faster than the mind. Though the all pervasive nirupadhika atma is devoid of all worldly attributes and is immutable, in the eyes of the non-discriminating people, It appears to be many, one each in different bodies, experiencing all modifications of samsara brought about by the upadhis.

5. Kathopanishad I.ii.21 - "Remaining stationary, It goes far; while sleeping, It goes everywhere." Sankaracarya explains that in sushupti, the differentiated consciousness of the knowing instruments is dormant and the undifferentiated original consciousness the atma is there seems to go everywhere. In the state when the differentiated knower-consciousness is active, the atma, though by Its own nature is motionless (being all-pervading) seems to travel far in accordance with the movement of its upadhi (the mind)."Kathopanishad I.ii.20 - "Atma is the subtler than the subtlest and greater than the greatest" ("anoraniiyaan mahatomahiiiyan)". Sankaracarya explains that the contradiction can be resolved if we take the substratum. As the substratum of everything, atma (Brahman) is the substratum of the greatest as well as the tiniest. Whether it is a mountain nama roopa or a microbe nama roopa, atma is the Existence. Brahman as Existence-Consciousness-Infinity is of a higher order of reality than the nama roopa. In this way, also, Brahman can be said to be greater than the greatest. Similarly, in terms of formlesslessness

and unobjectifiability, Brahman can be said to be subtler than the subtest. Sankaracarya's commentary – "Whatever great or atomic thing there is in the world, its substance (aatmatvam) is the eternal atma. Without atma, they become non-existent. The very atma is subtler than the subtle and greater than the great, because It is conditioned by all names, forms and activities which are its limiting adjuncts; i.e. And that atma exists as the atma in the heart of all beings beginning with brahmaa and ending with a clump of grass."

Section 24 - Understanding aspects of our true nature from sushupti

1. When we analyze sushupti, not only do we realize that existence-consciousness and not ahamkara is our real nature but we appreciate various aspects of that real nature. If existence or consciousness was an attribute of the ahamkara, we would cease to be conscious and cease to exist when ahamkara is non-functional. But we continue to as existence and consciousness. What comes and goes is not our real nature. Ahamkara comes and goes but existence-consciousness does not. Therefore existence-consciousness is our real nature. Similarly, in sushupti, when ahamkara is non-functional and existence-consciousness is still there, we have no sense of location, we have no punya papa, we have no sorrow, and we have no attributes. If sorrow, punya papa etc. were to belong to sakshi, not ahamkara, they would be there in sushupti in which ahamkara is not there and sakshi alone is there. So, we can reasonably conclude that located existence-consciousness, punya papa, sorrow etc. and attributes are not our real nature. We are the unlocated, attributeless existence-consciousness, free of punya papa, sorrow etc.
2. When we apply the law that what comes and goes is not our real nature, we also arrive at the conclusion that the knower-consciousness (the ahamkara) which experiences the external world in jagrat avastha, changes as the experiencer of the dream-world in

swapna avastha and becomes dormant in sushupti avastha is not our real nature. If the jagrat prapanca experiencer was my nature, I would always be awake. If the experiencer of the swapna avastha was my real nature, I would always be dreaming. If the non-experiencing ahamkara was my true nature, I would always be sleeping. What is constant through all these shifting experiences of the ahamkara is the unchanging consciousness, the sakshi. Therefore that alone is my true nature.

3. This method of reasoning is called anvaya-vyatireka. What is constant in all the states is called anvaya or anuvritti. What is there in one or more states and not in the others is called vyatireka or vyavritti. What is anvaya is the real nature. Another approach is that if sorrow etc were my nature, i.e. if they belong to atma, not ahamkara, they cannot be removed by knowledge. But sastra says "The knower of atma transcends sorrow". So, sorrow etc. belongs to ahamkara, not atma.

Section 25 – Consciousness: Appreciation of Pure Existence

Can we recognise the non-dual Brahman? Brahman is the unobjectifiable Existence-Consciousness- Infinity . A vyaavahaarika example for Brahman, the imperceptible Existence –Consciousness being available for recognition as the Existence in mama roopa in general and as reflected consciousness, particularly, in minds is light. Light manifests only where there are certain other forms of matter like solids, liquids, air, etc. Light is there is a vacuum also; though it is not manifest there; it is transmitted across the vacuum. For the astronaut in outer space, it is all darkness around, because there is no air for light to manifest. But, an astronaut from one space vehicle can see the other space vehicle; the light reflected by the other space vehicle is transmitted across the airless space and falls on his retina. (This is what enables the docking of space vehicles). A day to day example is my hand that you see. I cannot show to you light directly. Pure light is invisible. So, I introduce my hand in the field of the all pervading invisible light and I tell you that there is a principle called light because of which alone the hand is visible. Then, I withdraw my hand and ask

you to understand the existence of the light, even though it is not visible without the medium of the hand. Like that, Existence is there, whether nama roopa are there or not. Pure Existence cannot be perceived. When nama roopa are superimposed, together the nama roopa together with Existence are experienced as objects. That is what Brahman manifesting as the universe means. Intellectually, you have to eliminate nama roopa to appreciate pure Existence. Pure existence-pure consciousness is not available for perception. It is the mixture of the real sub-stratum, Existence, Brahman and the mithya nama roopa that is presented to us as objects. But we should have the wisdom to distinguish what is real and what is mithya. When you ask for water to drink, it has to be brought to you in a container, say, a paper cup. But after you have drunk the water, you discard the paper cup. Pure existence-consciousness has to be conveyed to our intellect through nama roopa. Just as you drink the water and discard the paper cup, when existence—consciousness along with nama roopa manifests as the universe, you have to discard the nama roopa and understand the reality, the sub-stratum, the pure existence. It is true that you can experience It only along with nama roopa. But, you can, intellectually eliminate nama roopa, i.e., the variety of objects outside and nama roopa inside, i.e., your body and mind and then what would be left would be pure existence outside and pure consciousness inside. That is to say, we can adopt the negative method. The negative method of defining Brahman is known as "not this, not this" ("*neti neti*"). We start from the axiom that Brahman is nodal, attributeless and infinite. So, we have to negate whatever is one among many and whatever has attributes and is limited. Plurality of objects arises from attributes, called roopa in Sanskrit and, corresponding to the attributes constituting an object, a name (nama) is given to the object. What distinguishes one object or one being from another and makes it limited are the nama roopa, the set of attributes, whether it is shape, colour, vibration, texture, smell etc. in things and the life instincts, the emotional expressions and the intellectual qualities in beings. In respect of these, there are variations; therefore we experience plurality. But what is common to all is existence

(isness). You look around. You see objects and beings. All are cognised in space and time. Existence is all pervading and indestructible. In between objects and beings also, there is existence. If there were no existence in between two trees, a third tree would not grow between the two trees. When a tree is cut and burnt, isness is not destroyed; it is transferred from the tree to ashes. When a pot is broken, what is destroyed is pot shape; isness of clay is transferred from pot shape potsherd shape. You go deeper and deeper, deeper than space itself. The sub-stratum of space itself is Existence. Space is a nama roopa with the attribute of sound (*sabda*). Thus, when you dismiss (negate) all nama roopa at one level after another, intellectually, you will arrive at pure existence. This existence is to be recognized as Brahman.

Section 26 - Recognizing Brahman as Consciousness

One may ask, "What you say is all right in theory. But, in practice, I only experience the world with nama roopa. If I have to see a rose, nama roopa like colour and shape must be there. If I have to hear music, existence, sound *nama roopa* must be there and so on. So, how can I recognize Brahman, pure Existence?" The answer is – "It is true that your experience of the world is with nama roopa. What you are experiencing is Brahman with nama roopa superimposed on It. But since pure Existence-Consciousness is not objectifiable, you are not aware that you are experiencing Brahman as well as nama roopa. So, it follows what cannot be objectified is Brahman. Now enquire "what is it that cannot be objectified?" What is it that does not become an object? Everything and every being in the outside world is an object for your sense organs and mind. Your own body with its sense organs is an object to your mind. You objectify your mind also. You are aware of your thoughts and the e changing conditions of your mind. So, you negate your body and your mind. But there is one thing that does not become an object. That is the I that is aware of the changes of the mind which I invoke as the same I when I talk of my having been angry yesterday bur my being calm today or my having slept happily, knowing nothing yesterday

and my recollecting that state today, on waking up. This I is the consciousness, the *sat-cit* (Existence –Consciousness), called Brahman. Behind what we experience as inanimate objects, it is recognisable as existence and behind what we experience as the knowing mind, it is recognisable as consciousness. **.** If all objects are negated, one may be inclined to think that there is nothing. In fact, one of the branches of Buddhism says that nothingness is the reality. But to say or think that nothingness is the reality – that itself requires consciousness. There is only one thing that can't be experienced but the existence of which cannot be denied; that is the constant I, the atma. This is the unnegatable remainder (*nisheda avadhi*). When faced with the advice, 'neti neti', in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, the unenlightened will ask, 'if I negate everything, nothing remains; so it is nihilism'. To that Sastra would ask 'what is it that says that there is nothing?' Even when the mind is not functioning, there is one thing that remains. That consciousness is yourself, the Brahman'. Cf. Brhadaranyaka Swayamjyotibraahmana, Ushastabraahmana and Kaholabraahmana**.**

Section 27 - Recognizing Brahman by Negation of the Knower

Yet another way of recognizing Brahman is by negating the knower (pramata). Limitation arises in any knower--known situation. Knower is limited because he is not the known. And anything that is known is limited because it is not the knower. But there is no known if there is no knower. So, by negating the knower, we can eliminate the known also. When the knower and the known are negated, what remains is consciousness. The proof is our dreamless sleep. In the state of dreamless sleep (sushupti avastha), there is no known, knowing or knower. In the waking state (jagrat avastha), there is a knower in us and we perceive objects or entertain thoughts. In the dream state (swapna avastha), also, there is a knower in us and we perceive a dream world. But in sushupti, there is no perception or thought. The knower himself is not functioning. But even in that state, I continue to exist as a conscious being. The consciousness that continues to exist even when the knower is not functioning is to be recognised as the atma.

Section 28 - Atma is the Same in All

In this avastha-, however, what we arrive at is the consciousness behind our mind. In technical language, this is called the *avastha traya viveka*", the method of analysing the states of waking dream and deep sleep. But that is not the end of the enquiry. Once I recognise that my real nature is pure consciousness-existence, observing other people I may arrive at the inference that their real nature is also pure consciousness-existence. But I have to understand that there are not many consciousnesses, but the consciousness in me in you and the others is the same consciousness and that there is only the non-dual Brahman-Existence-consciousness that is infinite, in terms of space, time and entity which, in nama roopa, we have to recognise as existence in all objects and in living beings as consciousness as well as existence. This understanding is obtained through the study of Sastra. For the infinitude, we cannot resort to logic.

Section 29 - Avastha Traya Viveka in Mandukya Karika

In the Avastha Traya Viveka, in Mandukya Karika, the microcosm (vyashti) and the macrocosm (samashti) are equated to show we are not limited individuals. The consciousness associated with the vyashti *upadhi*, the *sthoola sarira*) (visva) the consciousness associated with the samashti *upadhi, sthoola prapanca (Vaisvaanara)* are equated. Similarly, consciousness associated with the vyashti *sukshma sarira* (taijasa) and the consciousness associated with the samashti *sukshma sarira* , (*Hiranyagarbha*) are equated and the consciousness associated with the vyashti *karana sarira,* (prajna) and the consciousness associated with the samashti *karana sarira* (Iswara) are equated. This shows that consciousness in all bodies is the same and there is nothing like my consciousness and your consciousness.

Section 30 - Sakshi is the Same Consciousness in All

To recognize the unchanging principle that is self-evident and immediate, we introduce consciousness through *avastha traya viveka*. But that is not enough, because we recognize consciousness through the functioning of the mind; therefore, we may think that it is located in the mind and since minds are plural, we may think that consciousness is also plural. So we have to say that it is none other than the existence that we recognize as the existence which is the common substratum of nama roopa of the world that we experience. Existence is not localized; it is not limited in space, time or by entity. Existence is also consciousness. Consciousness is also unlocalised and unlimited. It is the infinite *Brahma caitanyam*. Being immediate to the mind, it is recognised as the unchanging consciousness behind the mind in us.

Section 31 - Consciousness Has No Origin or End

Sastra says that the non-dual, eternal consciousness – Brahman-Atman – is without a beginning and end. We can give supporting logic (*Saastra-sammata-yukti)* for this. To know that consciousness had a beginning at a point of time, the absence of consciousness prior to that point of time has to be known. But, can we talk of prior non-existence (pragabhava), in the case of consciousness? The crucial question is what was it that could know the prior non-existence of consciousness? Is it consciousness itself or is it something other than consciousness? The latter alternative has to be ruled out, because everything other than consciousness or a derivative of consciousness like ahamkara is insentient and what is insentient can never is credited with the knowledge function. The former alternative is also untenable. If consciousness or a derivative of consciousness exists at the time of apprehending the prior non-existence of consciousness, ex hypothesis, consciousness is not non-existent then. Similarly, to know that consciousness ended at a point of time, the absence of consciousness posterior to that point of time (pradhwamsaabhaava) has to be known. For any such knowledge itself, consciousness or a

derivative of consciousness is required. Therefore, consciousness is eternal. (Vide Sureswacarya's Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashysa vartika Chapter II, verse 651).

Section 32 - Existence Has No Origin or End

Similarly Sastra says that Existence is eternal. For this also we can give supporting logic. To know that existence originated at a particular point of time, a conscious entity has to exist prior to that point of time to be aware of the origin. So existence can have no beginning. To know that existence ended at a particular point of time, a conscious entity has to exist posterior to that point of time to be aware of the end. So existence has no end.

Section 33 - Flowing eternity

In Advaita Vedanta., there is a concept of flowing eternity, as distinguished from absolute eternity. Brahman, being infinite and beyond time is absolutely eternal. But we have to have a term for entities that operate in time but the beginning of which cannot be traced. This is called "pravaaha nityam". The cycle of srshti, sthiti, laya, the chain birth and death of jivatma, karma and karmaphalam and Maya would fall in this category.

Section 34 - Antahkarana is matter

There is a logic in saying that antahkarana is also matter, to support the sastra (Tattvabodha) talking of the antahkarana being produced by the satva amsa of the five subtle elements and Chandogya Upanishad referring to antahkarana as a product of food. Antahkarana interacts with other forms of forms of matter; e.g., administration of electric shock for various mental disorders, the use of lie detector and psychosomatic diseases.

Section 35 - Logic of Postulating Cidabhasa

1. Brahman is all pervading consciousness. Antahkarna functions as a conscious entity but pot does not. You cannot explain this, unless you postulate that the texture of the antakarana nama roopa superimposed on Brahman is such that it can reflect the consciousness, whereas the pot does not have that capacity. It is somewhat like the difference between a good conductor of electricity and a bad conductor.

2. This division of certain nama roopa like the mind being made sentient by consciousness being reflected in them and other nama roopa not having such capacity and hence remaining to be insentient is required for *bhoktru bhogya* (enjoyer-enjoyed) transaction. If such division was not there, before I begin to put food into my mouth, it will fly away.

3. If the eternal, unchanging consciousness alone is there, there would be nobody who is bound and Sastra would not be taking the trouble of teaching the means to attain moksha. A conscious entity that is susceptible to be affected by the avarana sakti of Maya has to be there to listen to sastra.

4. Pratyagatma (Brahman) being changeless (nirvikara) and amanah is not *srotra* (not a hearer) or a pramata (not a knower). Sastra cannot address it. Nor can it address a mere antahkarana which is inert. So a conscious entity other than pratyagatma is required to listen to "tat tvam asi" and to say "aham brahma asmi". This is the antahkarana which is enabled to be such an entity owing to the reflection of consciousness in it. (This logic is called *arthapatti*').

5. As ahamkara, I listen to the mahavakyam, "tat tvam asi". By *bhagatyaga lakshanaa*, I discard the limitedness indicated by the literal meaning of the word, "tvam" and the distance indicated by the literal meaning of the word," tat" and retain the implied meaning of the two words, which is "caitanyam" and understand the jivabrahmaikyam. When I say "aham brahma asmi", though the thought is in ahamkara, by "aham" I refer to atma. Once I

know “aham brahma asmi” I discard ahamkara, i.e. I disidentify myself with ahamkara and abide as Brahman.

6. The expression ‘I know” indicates two things. Since it is a verb, it indicates modification. Since it is a knowing process, it indicates sentiency. Thus for the verb ‘know’, you require a subject which is changing and which is sentient. Atma cannot be subject, because atma is nirvikara. Mind, by itself, cannot be the subject, because, though it is a changing entity, it is insentient. So, we have to introduce cidabhasa. It is ahamkara (antahkarana pervaded by cidabhasa) that says, ‘I know’. It is ahamkara, neither pure atma nor pure anatma, that can be the pramata, the karta, bhokta, the samsari and the liberated.

7. In Brhadaranyaka (III.iv.2 etc.), the Upanishad talks of atma as the seer of the seer (“*drashterdrashta*”), knower of the knower (“*vijnatervijnaata*”) etc. From this it is clear that there is a knower-consciousness and another consciousness which is the substratum of that consciousness. This does not mean that atma perceives or knows ahamkara. To perceive anything or to know anything, the consciousness has to undergo modification. Atma being changeless cannot be seer or knower. The meaning is that, in the presence of atma, cidabhasa is formed in the antahkarana. This is also what is meant when it is said that atma, as Sakshi, illumines the antahkarana. It is like my standing in front of a mirror. I don’t do anything. By my mere presence, reflection is formed in the mirror.

8. The eternal unchanging consciousness cannot be said to be the instrument of knowing specific separate objects, one after another. For having pot knowledge, tree knowledge, tiger knowledge, one after another, and each person having different cognitions, we need to have separate, changing consciousnesses in each person. Antahkarana with reflected consciousness is what meets this requirement. If the knowing consciousness was not in the form of separate individual consciousnesses, and if there was only the original consciousness common to all as a pramata, the objects of the world would all enter the

common consciousness, in one jumbled confusion – confusion, space-wise and time-wise. For example, you may see water in fire, cow in pot, the garbage in the food you are about to take. You may see a grandfather who died long ago holding the new-born grandson – and so on. We cannot even imagine the state of everybody perceiving everything together and, not only that, perceiving the past, present and future simultaneously. At the same time, to be able to be aware that I am the same person in and through the changing conditions of the body and the mind, I have to invoke an unchanging consciousness. Thus we have to postulate cidabhasa, the reflected consciousness in individual minds as well as the unchanging, all pervading consciousness, the atma.

9. In Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, there is a statement, "*na pretya samja asti*". One interpretation is that this refers to the disintegration of the karana sarira and sukshma sarira of a jnani at the time of videhamukti. How this is support for cidabhasa has been explained in the main text. Another interpretation is "In the body, after death, there is no consciousness". When the Upanishad says that after the body dies, there is no consciousness in it, it cannot be referring to the eternal, all pervading consciousness; the all pervading, eternal consciousness is there everywhere, in everything and at all times. It is there in the dead body also. If the Upanishad cannot be referring to the eternal consciousness available in the individual, the atma, the sakshi caitanyam, what is it that it is referring to when it says that consciousness is not there in the body after death? It must be referring to a consciousness which is in the body when it is alive and which goes out when the body dies. What goes out when the body dies is the sukshma sarira. Cidabhasa is a part of the sukshma sarira. So, it is the cidabhasa that is referred to in the mantra.

10. The existence of a changing consciousness separately in each of us by which each of us separately cognizes different objects one after another is a matter of experience. But when we connect the pramata of a cognition involved in a past experience and the pramata of the cognition involved in a present experience, as the same entity, we are

invoking an unchanging, constant, I, which was behind the pramata of the past experience and is now behind the pramata of the present experience . What is present in the changing pramatas is cidabhasa and what is invoked as the changeless, constant I is the cit (atma).

11. Cidabhasa is mithya. It belongs neither to atma nor the intellect. The example is the reflection of my face in the mirror. If the reflection of consciousness belongs to the mirror, the reflection should continue to exist even after I have walked away from the mirror. If it belongs to the face, there should be a reflection of the face even after the mirror is taken away.

Section 36 - Mind is objectified by cidabhasa

Mind is not self-effulgent; it becomes a knower-consciousness on account of the reflection of cidabhasa in the antahkarana. But the thoughts in our mind and the changing character of the mind itself are known to us. In this sense the mind is self-evident. As and when a thought arises, cidabhasa pervades it and on account of this we become aware of tour thought. Similarly, on account of the pervasion of cidabhasa in the antahkarana we are aware of the changing character of the mind, the changes caused by vasanas.

Section 37 - Original and reflected consciousness - An illustration

In Pancadasi, Vidyaranya gives beautiful examples for the original consciousness, the reflecting medium and the reflected consciousness (1) at the macrocosmic level and (2) at the microcosmic level. The examples, respectively, are (1) space pervading the cloud, water vapor laden cloud, space reflected in the conglomerate of water vapor droplets in the cloud and (2) space conditioned by a water filled pot, the water in the pot and space reflected in the water in the pot. At the macrocosmic level, Brahma caitanyam is compared to space

pervading the cloud. The reflecting medium, namely, Maya, is compared to the conglomerate of water vapor droplets in the cloud. The reflection of the consciousness aspect of Brahman in Maya is compared to the reflection of space in the conglomerate water droplets in the cloud. At the microcosmic level, Sakshi caitanyam is compared to the space pervading the pot. The reflecting medium, namely, the sukshma sarira is compared to the water in the pot. The reflection of consciousness in the sukshma sarira is compared to the reflection of space pervading the pot in the water contained in the p.

Section 38 - Original and Reflected Consciousness

The difficulty of distinguishing the original consciousness, the Sakshi, from the reflected consciousness, the cidabhasa is illustrated by Vidyaranya. He gives the example of a wall on which the general sunlight falls. On the same wall, superimposed on the general sunlight, reflected sunlight emanating from a mirror also falls. In this situation, one cannot perceive the general sunlight and the reflected sunlight separately. Similarly, in jagrat and swapna both Sakshi and cidabhasa are functioning simultaneously. So we are not able to distinguish Sakshi clearly. If the mirror is taken away, then one perceives the general sunlight separately. Like that, in Sushupti, when the antahkarana is dormant, Sakshi alone is 'shining'. So, by analyzing the sushupti experience, an intelligent man can recognize the Sakshi.

Section 39 - World is Like Shadow

My shadow is non-separate from me, in the sense that I can't walk away, leaving my shadow. But it is not part of me either. When I go to the coffee kiosk, I don't order two cups of coffee, one for me and one for my shadow. Brahman and the nama roopa are like a man and his shadow. The nama roopa are superimposed on Brahman; the Nama roopa are not away from Brahman. But they are not part of Brahman.

Section 40 – Exceptions to Jnani has no rebirth

Once ahambrahmasmi jnanam is gained, the sancita karma is destroyed and there is no aagami karma. Only the unexhausted portion of prarabdha continues till the physical body falls. When the physical body falls, the sukshma and karana sariras are dissolved; there is no rebirth; the jnaani 'becomes' Brahman. There is a discussion in Brahma Sutra 3.3.32, whether there are exceptions. A person cites instances from Smriti (Itihasas and Puranas) of certain jnanis being reborn and raises the doubt whether ahambrahmasmi jnanam leads to liberation. The examples are the Vedic teacher, Rishi Apantaratamas who was reborn as Veda Vyasa (Krishna-dwaipayana), at the behest of Vishnu, at the junction of dwapara and kali Yuga, of Vasishta who was reborn as Mitra-Varuna, as directed by Hiranyagarbha, of Bhrgu and others who were reborn from the sacrifice of Varuna and of Daksha, Narada etc. The Vedantin maintains that ahambrahmasmi jnanam does lead to liberation. But in the case of certain jnanis, called *adhikaari jivas*, even though they become jivanmuktas, they take rebirths. These rebirths are for the sake of fulfilling missions, entrusted to them by Iswara, relating to the welfare of the world like propagation of Veda. They retain their jnanam and continue to be jivanmuktas. They have control over the materials required for bodies, sense organs and minds and create new bodies and minds. The bodies and minds created may be one after another in succession or many bodies simultaneously. These are controlled by the reborn jivanmukta. These adhikari jivas remember their past lives. The rebirth is not account of sancita karma; sancita karma has already been destroyed. The mission for which they take bodies is a part of their prarabdha. These are special prarabdhas, where a part relating to loka sangraha remains, even after the end of the janma in which jnanam is gained. The missions may extend to many yugas even. When the loka sangraha prarabdha is over and the missions are fulfilled, these jivanmuktas attain videhamukti. Since once merged in Brahman there can be no rebirth and the jiivanmuktas having rebirths and fulfilling missions is itself a vyavaharika phenomenon, it is reasonable

to assume that until they attain videhamukti and 'become' Brahman', they are merged in Iswara. The adhikaari jivas should be distinguished from reincarnations (*avataras*) of Iswara. Adhikari jivas are reborn on account of prarabdha, whereas avataras are born out of Iswara's wish. (Incidentally, in the Smriti, there is mention of a jnaani having entered another body in the present janma itself. A woman-jnani, Sulabha, wanted to have a discussion with Janaka; she entered Janaka's body and after finishing the discussion with him, reentered her own body.) (In Brahmasutra 3.3.32, there is also mention of certain ajnanis remembering their past lives. They are called *jaatismaras*.)

Section 41 - Iswara srshti and jiva srshti. Iswara, karma and free will

(This is an elaboration of a topic already included in the main paper.)

1. Iswara srshti does not bind us. If it did, jnanis would also be bound because they also continue to live amidst jiva srshti. World is Iswara srshti. Our body and mind are also Iswara srshti. What binds is the reality (satyatvam) we attach to the world and our body and mind. Attaching reality to the world and our body and mind is jiva srshti, (it is our own making). The cause is avidya. As already mentioned in the main text, jivatmas who have not attained knowledge of jivabrahmaikyam are governed by karma. Iswara is the administrator of the karma (karmaphaladata) and, through Maya, creates the world including bodies and minds in accordance with the requirements of the myriads of jivatmas to go through enjoyment or suffering as warranted by their karma. The physical and mental equipment a person is born with, in which family he is born, in which environment he has to lead his life and the major situations he has to face in life will depend on his karma. Not all situations in life, though, arise solely out of one's own karma. Karmas of many people can combine to create a situation. There is also what is called *niyati*, examples of which are drought, flood, war etc. which affect all people in a region or the world as a

whole. How a person takes the initiative to create situations , how he faces situations created by others, how he makes use of the opportunities available to himself to develop himself, how he reacts to actions, behavior and conduct of other people, all these depend on his free will. In the same school, with the same teaching faculty and library, one works hard and studies well; another with an equally good brain wastes his time and fails to make the grade. One manages his office, being a friend of all; another manages the same office as a ring master. The situations we are faced with are Iswara srshti. How we face them is Jivasrshti. . What is there in creation is Iswara srshti. How one reacts to it is jiva srishti. The glaring example of this distinction is that we read so many obituaries in newspapers with emotional indifference but when it comes to a question of our own kith and kin we cry.

2. Another factor which operates in our life is v*asanaas*, tastes and attitudes resulting from the impressions of the experiences of our previous lives. Vasanas govern our action in the sense that towards the same object, different people have different likes and dislikes and the same situation different people face with different attitudes. One loves music; another can't stand any music One loves swimming; another does not want even to have a bath. One loses heart at the slightest obstacle; another bulldozes through the toughest situations. Vasanas of the past can also be changed or overcome by free will, with determination. Thus our life is interplay of Iswara srshti including niyati, our karma and vasanas and jivasrshti.

3. The very fact that human beings have a choice to do a thing, or not to do it or do it in a different way, is proof of free will. A powerful argument for free will is that, unless you accept free will, moksha will be impossible. Aspiring for moksha and making use of the opportunities available for spiritual advancement are matters of free will. Punya karma may even give you birth in a family of spiritual seekers, but whether you yourself take to the spiritual path depends on your free will. Papa karma may give you birth in a family of materialists, but, with your free will, you can transcend those surroundings and, if your

aspiration is intense, you will seek and find the set up where you can pursue your spiritual sadhana.

4. If free will is not accepted, there will be certain other problems –

(i) The commandments and prohibitions of scripture will become meaningless. Scripture is advising man to do good actions and avoid evil actions only because scripture assumes that man has free will.

(ii) If man has no free will and not merely his karmaphalam but fresh action is also impelled by Iswara, Iswara becomes responsible for the good action and bad action done by man. The problem then would be two-fold. By making some men to do good action and some men do bad action resulting in punya and papa followed by enjoyment or suffering as karmaphalam later, Iswara would become partial and cruel. Secondly, if Iswara is responsible for man's good action and bad action, no one can be rewarded nor can any criminal be punished. A murderer will say "I am not responsible for what I did. The Lord made me do it."

5. Since no one knows what one's karma is, the best way to act is to do action according to Dharma. Dharma in, the modern context, should be defined as principles of self-improvement, developing one's potential, putting forth utmost efforts to achieve legitimate goals, morality – not only personal morality but what may be called social morality - such as doing or not doing to others what you would like them to do or not to do to you, working for the greatest good of the greatest number, adhering to values like non-violence,, truthfulness, charity, having regard to ecological balance etc. When one is in doubt in any situation whether what one is intending to do is right or wrong, there are two ways; follow the example of great people, if available, or see that your motive is pure and do what your conscience dictates.

Section 42 - Enjoyment And Suffering Depends On Upadhi As Well As One's Reaction

1. The word. 'upadhi' is used here in the meaning of the body-mind complex of living beings. Enjoyment and suffering depends not only on the object of enjoyment but on the upadhi, the physiological and the mental equipment. Human equipment enables man to enjoy music, but a buffalo's is not adequate for that. The dog can hear frequencies of sound that we can't. For a snail the line it moves on consists the whole of its world. Animals – a dog, a cat, a horse – are two-dimensional beings. Their universe has the appearance and properties of a surface. What we regard as the properties of three dimensionality of objects appear as movements to them.. A horse passing a stationary bush feels that the bush has moved towards it and turned round and waved a branch. We, human beings know that the world is not a surface, whereas animals cannot know it. They accept everything as it appears. They cannot correct what the eye sees. We can measure in three directions, because, unlike the animals, we have concepts. Taking a cube, while measuring in one direction, we keep in mind the two others. For an animal, a sphere will resemble a vibrating undulating surface. For an animal, a new sun rises every morning. To Hanuman, the ocean he was crossing to go to Lanka was a puddle of writer in a depression caused by a cow's feet. When the demon, Surasa grew in stature by stages in order to swallow Hanuman, Hanuman could outgrow her and she was then like a mosquito which would go in and fly out of his mouth. If I had the capacity to see atoms, I would be seeing you not as a man with a head, hands and feet, but as waves or particles moving in concentric orbits. In *vayu loka*, your upadhi will enable you to travel in air without any vehicle. To the prodigy, Sakuntala, it takes only a minute to solve arithmetical problems which will takes several days to solve. But, even the loka where you are born and the upadhi with which you are born depends on karma. However the upadhi can be improved by free will within the limits of the loka in which you are born (-- there are *nava avadhaanis* who have, by yoga practice, developed

the capacity to grasp nine different questions or attend to nine different matters simultaneously and give answers. Developed by yoga practice, instances of *siddhis* - physical feats like floating in the air, swallowing crushed glass etc. and even changing the structure of a part of the body to make it like stone which will deflect a sword or like air to let the sword to pass through and mental feats like foretelling the future, reading another's mind etc. are also on record.

2. Enjoyment and suffering depends not only the objects and upadhi but your reaction to experiences, which again can be regulated by free will

Section 43 - Sukshma sarira is a continuous entity

A living being will be reborn only as a living being, because, the sukshma sarira is a continuous entity, going from one janma to another, carrying with it the karma which has to be exhausted in successive janmas.

Section 44 - Role of miracles, yogic powers etc.

Apart from the physical laws governing the universe, there are divine forces in the empirical plane. Evidence of such forces is found in certain temples, churches, mosques, drachmas etc. We have authentic accounts of miracles in the form of the sick getting cured in such places. There are also authentic accounts of certain persons who have acquired or have carried forward from previous janmas Yogic powers by which they are able to bring about changes in the life of devotees. In regard to temples etc., in certain cases, the powers are attributed to Yogis who have attained samadhi there and have deliberately left their powers to operate there. The important point to note, in all these cases, is that not all who visit and worship at the places mentioned above get the benefit of the divine or miraculous powers. This can only be explained by postulating that what happens in these places does

not fall outside the law of karma. Based on this premise, we should say that if a particular person gets a benefit, by way of cure or some other material advancement, it is predestined according to his karma itself that his suffering should be over at that time. It is just as a matter of the medium through which that takes place. In these cases, the medium for ending the suffering is the divine or miraculous force at such a place, just as the medium in other cases is a skilled doctor or a generous benefactor. Here also, free will comes into operation inasmuch as the choice of and the decision to go to a place of worship, like the choice of and decision to go to a skilled doctor is a matter of free will.

It is also possible to explain these things in another way. Sastra concedes that prarabhda karma can be mitigated by *prayascitta karma* (ritual, worship etc. done in a spirit of atonement for one's papa.). We can say that miraculous or yogic powers to which one resorts to, inm a spirit of faith and devotion for atonement of one's papa, takes the place of prarabdha karma. In any case, to what extent prarabdha will be mitigated will depend on the relative strength of prarabdha and the remedial measure. Sankaracarya concedes the existence of siddhis, acquired by yoga sastra sadhana, powers such as foretelling the future, reading another's person's mind etc. So, it is possible that persons with such powers can produce psychic vibrations which can affect the devotee. Where Sastra talks of a jnani being a sathya-sankalpa i.e., one who can obtain material, or provide remedy or accomplish desired ends for devotees by merely exercising his wish, we should interpret it as the psychic vibrations of a pure, unselfish, compassionate mind having an effect on the forces of nature.

Section 45 - Suspension of Prarabdha

Normally, prarabdha quota of the sancita which is next in the queue determines the next birth. But in the case of those who have performed religious sacrifices (yagnas) or done

upasana of deities, that prarabdha is postponed until they have enjoyed the fruits of that yagna or upaasana in the appropriate higher world.

Section 46 - Maya Does Not Have a Cause

Does Maya originate? No. Maya (moola avidya) is beginningless ("*anaadi*") but Maya is not beginningless in the sense that nitya Brahman is. Maya is said to be anaadi, because for Maya there is no cause. (*Maya ca avidya ca swayam eva bhavati* – Nrsimhapoorvatapanaiya Upanishad 9.3). Brahman is beginningless in the sense that It is eternal, infinite. There are only four possibilities to consider in trying to find out whether Maya has a cause –Brahman, Iswara, the universe ("jagat"), jiva, Brahman cannot be the cause because Brahman is eternal and changeless and for anything to be a cause of an effect, the cause has to undergo change. Iswara cannot be the cause, because Iswara is himself constituted of Brahman-consciousness reflected in Maya; the reflection cannot precede the reflecting medium. Neither jiva nor jagat can be the cause, because jiva and jagat themselves are effects (*karya*) of Maya. It is on account of Maya that Iswara, jagat and jiva are superimposed on Brahman. Maya is anaadi but Maya is has an end (it is "*sa-antah*") for every jnaani; every one who understands his identity with Brahman is free from the avarana sakti of Maya. For Brahman and, therefore, for the videhamukta Maya never exists.

Section 47 - Maya Cannot be Paramarthika

If Maya was also paramarthika, there will be no moksha. Maya generates ignorance of Brahmatvam and that leads to our notion of plurality (dwaitam) Real dwaitam cannot be eliminated. Dwaitam has to be vyavaharika, if ignorance of our Brahmatvam is to be dispelled. Moreover, if you say real dwaitam goes, it means advaitam (the state of being the non-dual Brahman) has come. So, advaitam becomes one with a beginning ("*sa-aadi*").

That which has a beginning will have an end. So, you have to accept that the advaitam that has come will go away, some time or other. That means your moksha will be temporary.

Section 48 - Content (Vishaya) and Locus (Asraya) of Maya

10. In sastra, there is discussion about the content (vishaya) and locus (asrsaya) of Maya. By vishaya, what is meant is the entity that is covered from our vision (understanding). It is our nature as Brahman that we, human beings are ignorant of. Therefore Brahman is the vishaya of Maya. To be precise, Brahman is covered from our 'vision' by the veiling power ("aavarana *sakti* ") of Maya. On this point, there is consensus.

1. But in regard to the location (asraya) of Maya, there is difference of opinion. Maya is mithya; it does not have existence of its own. So, like the snake on the rope, it has to depend for existence on a real entity. That is what is called its locus. According to Sankaracarya, Sureswaracarya and Prakasatman the locus is Brahman. According to Vacaspati Misra, the locus is jiva.
2. Pros and cons of the two views –

   (a) Jivas are, as parts of the creation of the universe, the products (karya) of Maya; Maya is the cause (Karanam). Though both Maya and jivas are chronologically beginningless, in the logical cause-effect order, Maya, as cause, is prior to jivas, the effect. Therefore, it would be illogical to say that jivas are the locus of Maya. In pralaya also, jivas are contained in seed for, in Maya, not the other way about. Secondly, Jiva themselves are mithyas. One mithya cannot be the sub-stratum for another mithya. Thirdly, if avidya is in jivas, since avidya produces jagat and reflection of Brahma caitanyam in Maya is Iswara, we should have the phenomenon of many jagats and many Iswaras. Iswara cannot be the locus because Iswara Himself comes into being by the reflection of brahma caitanyam in Maya. The only real entity

and entity logically prior to emergence of any other entities is Brahman. So, it would be logical to say that Brahman is the locus of Maya. In this connection, we should note that for Brahman there is no Maya; the location is only from the view point of jiva; "located in Brahman" means superimposed on (*adhyasta*) Brahman.

(b) The objection raised by those who hold the second view is that if Maya (moola avidya) is located in Brahman, since Maya is a single entity and liberation (moksha) consists in destruction of moola avidya, when any single human being, through knowledge of his nature as Brahman attains moksha, all others will also be automatically liberated. But this does not happen; even after any one human being attains moksha, all others continue to be afflicted by the avarana sakti of moola avidya and undergo samsara.

(c)The upholders of the first view adhering to their stand explain that though moola avidya is a single entity and it is located in Brahman, caused by the avarana sakti of moola avidya, each jiva, separately, has the dehaabhimaana (identification with his own body mind complex).. It is this that is destroyed when a particular jiva gains ahambrasmi jnanam. The dehabhimana of other jivas continues. It is somewhat like an object concealed in a dark room; there is no light; people are groping around to discover it; one person managed to go near and touch it; he perceives it; others are still ignorant.

11. Another objection that is raised is that Brahman, being of the nature of jnanam (knowledge), Avidya (Maya) being of the nature of ignorance Are opposed to each other. Therefore Brahman cannot be the locus of Maya. The answer to this is three-fold. (a) When Brahman is said to be of the nature of jnanam, it is not pramana jnanam (vritti jnanam) involving the distinctions of the

knower, the known and the knowledge that is meant, but swaroopa jnanam. It is vritti jnanam that is opposed to ignorance, not Swaroopa jnanam. Moreover, Maya is mithya. Swaroopa jnanam which is satyam is not opposed to mithya Maya. On the other hand, swaroopa jnanam through cidabhasa illumines Avidya (Maya); not only is Brahma caitanyam reflected in Maya, but swaroopoa jnanam, through cidabhasa, reveals avidya; by study of sastra, the wise man comes to know about Maya and the avarana sakti and overcomes it by gaining knowledge of Brahman. Thirdly, when the word, 'ajnanam' is used for Maya, it does not mean ignorance of objects but a power which produces ignorance of Brahmatvam in jivas' mind. It does not produce ignorance in Brahman. What is opposed to ajnanam in the sense of ignorance of Brahmatvam in jivas' mind is vritti jnanam; the ahambrahmasmi vritti jnanam destroys jivas' ignorance of Brahmatvam.

Section 49 - Status of Time. Relation of Maya and Time

We cannot say that time has a beginning. Anything that begins has to begin in time. Therefore to say that time began, we have to postulate another time during which this time began. And we have to postulate a third time to locate a beginning for the second time, and so on, without end. So, to say that time has a beginning will lead to infinite regress (*anavastha dosha*). So, we have to accept that time is beginningless. Since time is without a beginning, we cannot say that time is a product of Maya. Thus, time, along with Maya, Iswara, the cycle of creation and dissolution, jiva and karma, is a beginningless entity. Seeking a definition of Maya, the author of Vicara Sagara says that time is the relation of Brahman and Maya. Relation is not either of the related entities; so, time is a part of neither Brahman nor Maya. The relation of a real and a mithya entity is also mithya.

Section 50 - Iswara, the Inner Controller (Antaryaami)

The whole dream world is in our mind. Vasanas in our mind alone modify to become the dream. Like that Maya is Iswara's mind. In Maya, Iswara's mind, the nama roopa part of the universe is in seed form and, in creation, Iswara's mind, Maya, modifies to become the differentiated nama roopa. This unfolding of nama roopa takes place within Iswara. Unlike our being unaware that the dream is only a projection of our vasanas, Iswara is aware of what is happening in creation. Iswara is omniscient and is aware of what is for us the past and the future as well as the present. The potential condition of the universe is Iswara's causal form (kaarana prapanca is Iswara's kaarana sariram.). The subtle (invisible, amoortha) aspect of the universe, the sukshma prapanca, is Iswara's aspect called Hiranyagarbha and the gross (visible, moortha) aspect of the universe, sthoola prapanca is Iswara's aspect called Virat. Iswara is not only the creator (srshti karta) and the ground of resolution of the universe (layasthaanam), but is also the sustainer of the universe (sthiti karta). In his function as a sthiti karta, He is called the Inner Controller (antaryami). We get a description of Iswara as antaryami in Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 3.7.3 to 3.7.23, such as "He who inhabits the sun, but is within it, whom the sun does not know, whose body is the sun, and who controls the sun from within, is the internal Ruler, your own immortal self", " He who inhabits the intellect, but is within it, whom the intellect does not know, whose body is the intellect, and who controls the intellect from within, is the Internal Ruler, your own immortal self" The words, 'immortal self' refers to the fact that the essential nature of Iswara is Brahma caitanyam, the atma. As the Internal Controller Iswara is the regulator of cosmic laws and administrator of karma phalam. Incidentally, in this connection, we also find the answer to the question where are undiscovered laws are located. For example before Newton's discovery, what was the location of the law of gravity? The answer is 'in Iswara'.

Iswara is witness of avidya and of everything that takes place in the universe. That is to say, the cidabhasa part of Iswara is aware of the *avyakta* (the unmanifested) and the *vyakta*

(manifested) condition of the universe and of not only the present but the past and future. Time does not resolve in *pralaya* (when the universe resolves into unmanifested condition). Iswara watches the fructification of the karma of jivas and initiates a new creation.

Section 51 - For Brahman there is no Maya or universe

1. Earlier, it was said that Iswara, Maya and the universe exist as lower orders of reality only from the point of view of jivas who, like Iswara, Maya and the cycle of creation of the universe, are beginningless and that for nirguna Brahman, there is no Iswara or Maya or universe even as lower orders of reality. There are two reasons why we jivas have to postulate Iswara, Maya and the universe. The eternal, non-dual, changeless Brahman devoid of instruments of knowledge and action is said to be the cause of the universe, but we do experience a universe; therefore we have to postulate an intelligent cause and a material cause other than Brahman. That is Iswara and Maya, respectively. Secondly, we, jivas, Sastra says, are by nature Brahman but are ignorant of the fact and we suffer in samsara. Therefore we have to predicate a power which hides our real nature from us. And that is Maya. Since Brahman is non-dual, all these that we predicate have to be assigned a lower order of reality. But all these predications are only for us jivas. For Brahman, there is no Iswara or Maya or a world of nama roopa, not even as lower orders of reality. As cited earlier, Upanishads say that Brahman is acakshuh (devoid of eyes), asrotram (devoid of ears), arasah (devoid of tasting faculty), and amanah (devoid of an objectifying knower-consciousness). nishkriya (devoid of action) etc. So, there is no question of Brahman perceiving or knowing a universe or jivas or Maya or Iswara or a world of nama roopa, even as lower orders of reality -Vide Chandogya 7.24.1 “The Infinite is that where one does not see anything else……..know anything else.”. “Kaivalya Upanishad 23 – “For Me there is neither Earth nor Water, nor Fire nor Air nor Space. (‘Me’ refers to the ‘I’ mentioned in

verse 22 – 'I alone am the theme taught in the Vedas' – thus 'for Me' means 'for Brahman)". Mandukya Upanishad mantra 7 – "....beyond empirical dealings.....in which all phenomena cease.....non-dual (...avyavahaaryam.....prapancopasamam......advaitam). Verse 32 of Vaitathya prakaranam of Mandukya karika – "There is no dissolution, no origination, none in bondage, none striving or aspiring for salvation, and none liberated. This is the position from the standpoint of paaramartika satyam". This means that, the vyavaharika world exists only for jivas who are in the universe. For nirguna Brahman, there is no world and there is no Maya or Iswara.

2. We see from Brhadaranyaka II.iv.12, that that once the physical body falls, ("pretya"), for the videhamukta, there is no longer the objectifying knower-consciousness, the ahamkaara, and we know from other passages that he becomes Brahman Itself. Brhadaranyaka 3.2.11, and 4.4.7, Prasna 6.5 and Mundaka 3.2.7, read with 3.2.6 also say that a sukshma sarira of a Jivanmukta dissolves at the time of videha mukti in the cosmos, when he becomes Brahman Itself. Without a sukshma sarira with ahamkara, where is the question of there bring anything else for Brahman to know?
3. Rememebering that an example is not an illustration in all respects, we can take the rope and the snake. Snake is a superimposition. It is seen by the passer-by in semi-darkness. When light is brought it disappears. Rope is like Brahman; it is the adhishtanam. Snake is like the world. Semi-daarkness is like Maya.The passer-by is like the jiva affected by the avarana sakti of Maya. Disappearance of the snake when the light is brought is like the disappearance of the world for videhamukta. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that the rope is a conscious entity, we can say that for the rope there is no snake. Like that, for Brahman there is no world.

12. In Brhadaranyaka Upanishad Bhashya Vartika, (I.4.299 and 1.4 300-30,4 ?) Sureswaracarya says that for Brahman there is no world or avidya at all. Sureswaracarya says expressly that for

Brahman, there is no world or Maya. Sankaracarya also says in Brahmasutra bhashyam II.i.14, "Thus the Upanishads speak of the cessation of all empirical dealings in the state of the Highest Reality (*Evam paramaartha-avasthaayaam sarva-vyavahaara-abhaavam vadanti vedaaantaah sarve"*) which means that in the paramartika plane, there is no world at all.

Section 52 - Dream Is Example for Unreality of Jagrat Prapanca

1. In Advaita Vedanta, dream world (*swapna prapanca*) is taken as an example to show that, just as the *swapna prapanca* is realised to be unreal when we wake up, the waking world (*jagrat prapanca*) becomes unreal when we gain knowledge of the non-dual Brahman.. That the *swapna prapanca* is nothing but thoughts in the mind of the 'waker' is known when he wakes up from sleep. ('Waker' is a term adapted for convenience to refer to a person who has gone to bed and is having a dream, to distinguish him from the subject in the dream experiencing the dream objects, which we shall call "dream pramata" or "dream I " or "pratibhasika I") In the dream, the waker sees an elephant or a mountain. Where is the required space in his head for either? Or, in the dream, he goes from New Delhi to New York when only a minute of *jagrat* time has passed. Where is the time required for the journey? And when he wakes up, he finds himself, not in New York but in New Delhi. In the dream he meets his old friend and talks to him, but when he gets up he knows that the friend died a few years ago. Or, a barren woman dreams that she has a son. Or a blind person may dream that he has eyesight (Cf. Chandogya 8.10.1). Or a person is ill but is still in his house when he goes to bed. In his dream, he is hospitalised and when he is discharged, the Doctor advises him to continue for another week with the tablets of medicine a part of which he is taking home. Will he find the medicines when he wakes up? Or, when he goes to bed, his bank balance is Rs.10000. In the dream, he wins a lottery of 20 million rupees. When he gets up, can he issue a cheque against that? Or one goes to bed on a new moon night switching off all lights but in the dream one is basking in the sun. Or one has gone to bed after a full meal but in the dream one feels ravenously hungry or vice versa.

And one sees things in dream, which are strange from the point of view of jagrat experience, such as oneself with the head of an elephant or water flowing upwards or oneself flying the air or cutting one's own head or oneself with eight hands or oneself riding an elephant with four tusks.. In the dream, a chariot may turn into a man in the dream itself or a man may turn into a tree. When we wake up, we know that we had a dream, but often, we do not remember what the dream was, and, if sometimes we do, we remember it only vaguely. Thus, the space, time, patterns of behaviour and cause-effect relationship as they are required for jagrat experience are not there in the swapna prapanca. So we regard the swapna prapanca as unreal.

1. Sub-dream within dream clearer example of unreality of jagrat prapanca .

Within my main dream, I may have a sub-dream. I go to bed at New Delhi and have a dream. In the dream, I see myself going to Chennai. Obviously this is not myself lying in the bed. This is a dream I projected by my mind while I am still lying in bed. This dream I does a lot of shopping in Burma Bazaar and being tired falls asleep as soon he reaches the Taj Coramandel Hotel. There, the dream I has a sub-dream. In this sub-dream, the sub-dream I is going to New York, stays in Waldorf Astoria, and goes to bed there after a sumptuous dinner. When the New York sub-dream I wakes up, he finds that he is not in New York but at Chennai; then the Chennai main dream I realises that his going to New York etc. were unreal and he has remained in Chennai. When the waker who was having the dream wakes up, he finds himself at New Delhi; then the waker realises that even his shopping in China bazaar at Chennai was unreal. Now the dream as well as the sub-dream has become unreal. If we substitute the sub-dream for *swapna prapanca* and the main dream of the waker for our *jagrat prapanca*, we can understand what we mean by saying that the *jagrat prapanca* as well as the *swapna prapanca* that we experience are unreal.

Just as, when the waker wakes up at Chennai, both the Chennai main dream and the New York sub-dream become unreal, for one who has “woken up” to the knowledge of *jaganmithya brahmasatyam* both the *swapna* and the *jagrat prapanca* become unreal (*mithya*).

2. What happens during the state of dream (*swapna avastha*) is as follows:-

During the course of sleep, when a person is dreaming, his physical body and his sense organs are resolved and are non-functional but his *ahamkara* is functioning. But the ahamkara is not in a position to contact the external world because the physical body and sense organs are not available. In this state of the *ahamkara*, *vasanas*, also called *samskaras*, i.e., impressions stored in the citta portion of the ahamkara, based on the person's experience during the *jagrat avasthas* of past period of life (*janma*) and even of past *janmas* are activated. In any particular swapna avastha, some of these vasanas emerge in the mind of the waker and the waker's *ahamkara* projects a dream world based on those vasanas. The dream world is not, really outside the waker's *ahamkara*. But, due to the power of *nidra* (sleep), a mini-*Maya*, what are only thoughts within the waker's ahamkara appear to him as a world outside his mind. That is how the waker perceives a dream world. In this dream world, there are not only dream objects (*swapna padaarthaas*, *swapna prameyam*), but a dream knower (a *swapna pramaata*, a dream I) who perceives the *swapna prameyam* including other dream persons, dream animals, dream trees etc. and dream instruments of knowledge (*swapna pramaanam*) which includes not only dream sense organs (*swapna indriyas*) but also a dream mind (a *swapna ahamkara*). It is with the *swapna indriyas* that the *swapna pramaata* contacts the *swapna prameyam* and it is with the

swapna ahamkara that he cognises the *swapna prameyam*. During the dream, the waker is identified with the swapna pramaata. Identified with the swapna pramaata, the waker takes the *swapna avastha* to be real. As soon as the he wakes up, he realises that what he thought was a real world was merely thoughts in his own mind based on his *vasanas*. Thus he knows that the swapna prapanca is unreal.

In Mandukya karika, in *Vaitathya prakaranam*, the example for *jagrat prapanca* being mithya is *swapna prapanca*. In *Advaita prakaraman*, the example is pot space. If pot space were real, when a pot is taken from Adyar to Besant Nagar, there should be a vacuum at the point where the pot was is Adyar and a struggle for the pot to enter at the point to which the pot has been brought in Besant nagar.

3. Features of dream that show unreality of jagrat prapanca. In *Sastra*, the *swapna avastha* is taken as an example for the unreality of the *jagrat prapanca*, from the point of view of the paramarthika satyam. Just as the waker, during the *swapna avastha*, divides himself into *swapna pramaata, a swapna prameyam* and a *swapna pramanam* and, in ignorance, takes them to be real, the jiva who in his real nature is the divisionless Brahman, divides himself, in the *jagrat avastha*, out of ignorance, into a *jagrat pramaata, a jagrat prameyam* and a *jagrat pramaanam* and takes them to be real. Like the waker realising, when he wakes up, that the *swapna prapanca* was unreal, when the *jagrat jiva* "wakes up", i.e., gains the knowledge of his real nature as Brahman, he dismisses the *jagrat prapanca* as *mithya*. The waker identifies himself with the swapna pramata and experiences the pleasure and pain of the swapna pramaata. If the swapna I, as bhokta, is having sexual contact with a woman, the waker feels the pleasure of the contact. If the swapna I, as the victim in an accident is mauled by a tiger, the waker is scared and often, the fright is so intense that he wakes up suddenly. Like that, the jiva,

who is really the asanga atma, identifies himself with his body and mind and takes the pleasure and pain of the body and mind to be his pleasure and pain. When the waker wakes up from the dream and becomes the vyavaharika jiva, he is disidentified with the dream I. He realises that what happens in the swapna prapanca cannot affect him. A dog may have bit the dream I in the dream but the vyavaharika jiva does not find even a scratch in his body. The dream I may have met a beautiful girl in the dream in a house which appeared like a house known to him in the waking state and may have wanted to marry her; when the vyavaharika goes to the house where he met the girl, all that he finds there are an old woman and his wife. In the dream a person may have won a million rupees in a lottery and deposited it in his bank. After he wakes up and goes to the bank he will find that his bank balance is just the two thousand rupees entered in the pass book on the previous day. In the *svapna* example, there are two conscious entitles – a pratibhasika conscious entity, the dream I and a vyavaharika conscious entity, the waker I lying in bed. In the same way, in *jagrat avastha*, there is a vyavaharika conscious entity, the *pramaata* I and a paramarthika conscious entity, the *sakshi* .Just as the waker, when he has woken up as the vyavaharika jiva, realises that the swapna prapanca is mithya, when the vyavaharika jiva wakes up, i.e. gains knowledge of his true nature as the infinite Brahman, he realises that the jagrat prapanca is mithya.

4. When Advaita Vedanta gives the example of *swapna prapanca* for saying that, just as the *swapna prapanca* (which is *pratibhasika*) is unreal relative to the *jagrat prapanca* (which is *vyaavahaarika*), the *jagrat prapanca* (which is *vyaavahaarika*) is unreal, relative to the *paramartika plane*, an opponent argues that both the *swapna prapanca* and the *jagrat prapanca* enjoy the same order of reality. His argument is that the only difference is that the *swapna prapanca* is within the head of the waker and the *jagrat prapanca* is outside his head and both his head and the outside space are *vyaavahaarika*. The Vedatin's answer is that when the opponent says "the world is inside the head of the waker" he is talking from the point of view of the waker after he has got up from sleep. But from the point of the waker when he is in the state of dream, the *swapna prapanca* is outside his head. The *adhyasa* of the jivatma in the

jagrat avastha – the jivatma taking the world to be real - is comparable to the waker's experience – the waker taking the dream world to be real - when he is still in the stage of dream and the *jaganmithya brahma satyam jnanam* of the *jivanmukta* is comparable to the realisation of the unreality of the dream world by the waker when he has got up from sleep.

5. Visishtdvaitins hold that swapna prapanca is also a world created by the Lord and the jiva's sukshma sarira goes out and experiences that world. Advaitins agree that, through the identification of the waker with the swapna I, the jiva does exhaust some of his prarabdha through his role as the swapna I experiencing the swapna prapanca. Whether the swapna prapanca is called Iswara srshti or jiva srshti, the fact remains that it is pratibhasika and that the sukshma sarira of the jiva is not separated from the sthoola sarira lying in bed. The experience is not by the sukshma sarira going out but by its identifying itself with the dream I that is out there in the svapna prapanca and is experiencing objects. If the sukshma sarira has gone out into the swapna prapanca, it means that only the sthoola sarira is lying in bed. In that case, which is the entity which gets scared when the swapna I is mauled by a tiger in the swapna and makes the sthoola sarira get up? If the sukshma sarira has gone out and fallen in love with a girl in a house that appears to be no different from a house known to him in the jagrat avastha, he would go to that house when he wakes up and ask for the girl's hand in marriage.

Section 53 - Refutation of Plurality of Atmas and of Atmas Being Part of Brahman

1. Visishtadvaitins also accept that Brahman is being all pervading is, no doubt, is immanent in the universe. Their Brahman (paramatma) is a saguna Brahman, a personal God, called Narayana or Vishnu. He has a twin property (*uubhaya vibhutii) – Leela Vibhuti* in the universe which exists for his sport (*Leela)* and enjoyment *(*bhoga, and a *Nitya Vibhuti* –transcendence in the divine world called Sree Vaikuntha Paramapadam. (The transcendental body has five modes (*prakaras*) – *para, vyuha vibhu, antaryaami, haarda roopa and archa).* Paramatma is the

material cause (*upadana karanam)* as well as the intelligent cause (*nimitta karanam*) of the universe and the one who sustains it and resolves it unto Himself. The universe consists of insentient matter, prakriti, called acit and sentient beings, jivatmas, called cit. Cit and acit are the worldly body (*sariram, prakaara, viseshanam, dharma)* of paramatma. Before creation, they are in subtle (*sukshma)* form without form, name and identification in paramatma.

Creation is the unfolding by paramatma of the cit and acit with name, form, identification etc. The attributes of the paramatma are satyam (independent existence), jnanam (eternal, unchanging consciousness) and anantam - not limited in space or time or by entity (*vastu* ; freedom from limitation entity wise is on account of paramatma's ubhayavibhuti *(*i.e., paramatma alone is there in transcendental mode and as Sriman Narayana and as the worldly mode(*prakaar*a) in the form of cit and acit*)*, omniscience (*sarvajnatvam*), omnipotence (*sarvasaktimatvam*), rulership (Iisitatvam, rulership over cit and acit), power to bring about whatever he wills (sarvakalpatvam), changelessness (*nirvikaaratvam* being the support (*aadhaara)*, and the Controller (*niyamaka) and Lord (seshi)* of cit and acit etc.. These are His attributes (*dharmaas, viseshnams)*; they distinguish Him from the insentient, finite, changing acit and the finite cit whose knowledge as attribute is subject to contraction. By the very function of distinguishing Him from cit and acit, they constitute His nature (*swaroopam*) like the attributes of a cow (which distinguish it from horse etc.). (Vide Ramanuja in Vedanta Sangraha -(Swaroopa *niroopana dharma sabda hi dharma mukhena swaroopam api pratipadhyanti gavaadisabdavat*). Thus, for example, He has dharma jnanam as well as swaroopa jnanam. There are countless jivatmas. Each jivatma (called *cit*) has a separate atma of his own, besides his body. This atma also has two aspects, one, knowledge and bliss (jnanam and aanandam) as His nature (*swaabhika, swaroopa)* and jnanam as attribute (*dharmabhoota jnanam)*. The dharmabhoota jnanam, contracts in the state of samsara on account of beginningless karma involving ignorance of one's own swaroopam and of paramatma; this dharmabhootajnanam expands to its full stature in the state of moksha. The goal of jivatma is to know parmatma's perfection. Sadhana, with free will conferred by paramatma, consists of cultivation of virtues,

study of Veda, karma yoga, spirit of surrender to the paramatma, and *bhakti* consisting of meditation on the paramatma, resulting, with paramatma's grace, in attainment of release from samsara (moksha). (Vision of paramatma is not possible with the ordinary means of perfection. Bhakti is the unique form of knowledge which enables the devotee to get a vision of paramatma.) It is paramatma, by His Grace, that effectuates the jivtma's release from samsara. Moksha is not cessation of individuality; it is attainment of residence in Vaikuntha with the benefit of constant, blissful, adoration of paramatma. Even in moksha, the mukta jivatmas maintain their separate individualism with *desa* and *vastu pariccheda* (limited in space and by entity). (Even nitya *suris* like Garuda, Adisesha, and Vishvaksena etc. who are eternally without karma and hence never have *prakriti-sambandha*, have the desa and vastu paricccheda.) Visishtadvaitins alsoclaim that in spite of being the material cause of creation, paramatma is changeless inasmuch as it is paramatma's body alone which gets expanded as cit and acit and becomes the universe but there is no change in paramatma's swaroopam. They say that Svetasvatara mantra "*nirguna*" means, not that paramatma is without attributes (*nirvisesha*), but that paramatma is pure and free of all evil attributes; the word only denies imperfections characteristic of finite existence. He is *sarvakalayaanagunaaakaraka*. Paramatma, cit, acit, creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe are all equally real.

2. The proposition that, apart from Brahma caitanyam, there are myriad caitanyams, as the body of Brahman, and that these jivatmas remain, both in the state of samsara and in the state of moksha, remain as separate entities is opposed to the Advaita doctrine of jivabrahmaikyam. The thesis that the body of paramatma is transformed by paramatma into myriad jivatmas, each with a separate atma of its own, different from Brahma caitanyam, with two types of jnanam, one eternal swaroopa jnanam and the other contracting and expanding dharma jnanam is, also, according to the Advaitin, contradictory to Sruti statements. Apart, from the four *mahavakyas*, there are numerous Sruti statements which assert that the atma of jivatmas is non-different from Brahman. Inter alia, Taittiriya 2.1.1., first defines Brahman "*satyam, jnaanam, anantam Brahma*" and in the same mantra says" from *atma* was born *aakaasa*" and it thus equates

Brahman and atma. . In Sankaracarya's' commentary. he says, “Since in the text, ‘From that Brahman indeed which is this atma (was produced this space)’, the word atma is used with regard to Brahman Itself; it follows that Brahman is the atma of the cognising individual. “One who worships another god thinking ‘He is one, I am another, he does not know” (Brhadaranyaka 1.4.10), “One only without a second” (Chandogya 6.2.1). Chandogya 8.14.1 and Swetasvatara 1.12 equate Brahman and atma. Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.18 also, which describes the sakshi as the Prana of the prana, the Eye of the Eye, the Ear of the Ear and the Mind of the Mind, equates atma and Brahman. Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.25 – “That great, birthless atma is undecaying, immortal, ….infinite. Btrahman indeed is fearless. He who knows the atma as the fearless Brahman becomes the fearless Brahman” In his commentary on Brahma sutra 1.4.14 also, Sankaracarya says, citing Taittiriya 2.1.1, ‘By using the word, atma” with regard to Him (Brahman) subsequently, and by placing the atma successively inner and inner in a series of sheaths, counting from this body, He (Brahman) is shown to be *pratyagatma* (Taittiriya 2.2 to 2.5). Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.13 – “All is his atma, and he again indeed is the atma of all”. Taittiriya 2.1.1 defines Brahman as infinity. The infinite cannot have parts. If it has, it ceases to be infinite. In Brahadaranyaka 3.4.1 and 3.5.1, Ushasta and Kahola ask Yagnavalkya to teach them the Brahman that is immediate and direct - the atma within all and Yagnavalkya starts the teaching saying “This is your atma that which is in all “.In the same Upanishad, in 3.8.11, Yagnavalkya tells Gargi “This *aksharam* is beyond thought but is the Thinker; It is never known but is the knower” and adds “There is no other Thinker than It; there is no other knower than It.” (This is a clear statement negating many conscious beings as jivas, separate from Paramatma). In 4,3,7 the question is asked, “Which is the atma?” and Yagnavalkya answers, “ this infinite entity (“*Purusha*”) that is identified with the intellect and, attaining the likeness of the intellect, thinks ‘as it were' and shakes ‘as it were'.”. Swetasvatara 3.18 talks of the Lord of the universe dwelling in the body going out and contacting objects through the sense organs. 3.13 talks of Brahman dwelling in the heart being the Lord of the mind. In Brhadaranyaka 1.4.7 Brahman is said to have entered into the universe including the bodies of beings. And the Upanishad goes on to say

that when It does the function of living It is called *praana*.....when it thinks, It is called the mind. Aitereya Upanishad, 1.3.11 says that Brahman wanting to enter the *indriyas* and the mind asks, “if seeing, hearing and thinking can be done without me, who am I?” All these indicate that Brahma caitanyam and the atma that enables the sense organs and the mind to function as conscious entities are the same caitanyam. In Mundaka 2.2.8 (in some texts it may be 2.2.7), it is said Brahman (called “the savajna” and “*sarvavid*”) seated in space within the luminous city of Brahman (i.e., the mind) is said to be conditioned by the mind. In Brahadaranyaka 4.4.5 also, “the atma indeed is Brahman (*ayam atma brahma*) is spoken of as “identified with the mind, the intellect, praana and the sense organs.” Again, in the same strain, in 3.1.2, Aitereya Upanishad talks of atma as the mind and in 3.1.3 enumerates various vrittis of the mind like thinking, suffering and memory as names of Consciousness (*prajnaanam*) and in 3.1.4, says that this *prajnaanam* (the consciousness behind the individual minds) is Brahman.“. In Brhadaranyaka 3.4.1, the atma equated with Brahman which is within all is spoken of as that ‘which moves forward through the prana etc. Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.18 – “Those who have known the Prana of the prana, the Eye of the eye, the Ear of the Ear, and the Mind of the mind have realized the ancient primordial Brahman. In all the passages cited above, whether we take the Brahma caitanyam as merely conditioned by the mind or as reflected in the mind, in all these passages, since the same Brahman is said to be associated with praana and the mind, t talk of plurality of atmas would be contradictory. Mundaka Upanishad says expressly that anyone who knows that supreme becomes Brahman. So, how can jivatmas be said to remain as separate entities even in the state of moksha? Mundaka Upanishad 3.2.5, 3.26 and 3.2.7 also go against the part whole theory. 5 says, “Having attained Brahman (i.e., having identified themselves with Brahman), being contented with the knowledge ‘aham brahma asmi', remaining free of desire and tranquil, the seers (*rishis')* attain the all pervading entirely and, when the body falls, merge in the Brahman that is all.”(Sankaracarya compares it to space apparently confined within a pot merging in all pervading space on the breaking of the pot.) 6 says, “Those to whom the entity presented by the Vedic knowledge has become fully ascertained, at the supreme moment of final

departure all of them become identified with the supreme Immortality in the worlds that are Brahman. Sankaracarya explains 'in the worlds that are Brahman" means "in Brahman" and adds "like a lamp blown out or like the space in a pot when broken.") 7 says "all become unified with the Supreme Undecaying."" In Mundaka Upanishad, II.ii.9, (in some texts, it will be 2.2.10) it is said that anyone who knows that Brahman becomes Brahman indeed. Kaivalya 10 says, "Seeing one's own atma in all beings and all beings in atma, one attains the highest Brahman. And Kaivalya 16 says, "That which is the supreme Brahman, the atma in all.....That alone art Thou, Thou alone art That". Brhadaranyaka IV.iii.32 – "It becomes (homogenous) like water, one, the witness and without a second. This is *brahmaloka (*the paramarthika state of Brahman*)*". Chandogya Upanishad 8.12.3 is significant. It says "This tranquil one (the reference is to jivatma), rising up from this body (the reference is to videhamukti), 'becomes one with the supreme light' and 'is established in his own nature'. Brhadaranyaka 4.4.6 is also significant. Talking about Jivanmukti and Videhamukti, it says".....being but Brahman, he (i.e., Jivanmukta) is merged in Brahman" Words like "Becoming one with the supreme light" and "is established in his own nature" "being but Brahman, he is merged in Brahman" constitute incontrovertible proof that the atma in us is no different from Brahman. In Brhadaranyaka 2.4.12 (repeated in 4.5.13, the Upanishad, talking of videha mukti, says that the (particular) consciousness of jivas ceases at that time ("*na pretya samja asti*"). Whether we take 'samja' as cidabhasa or the mere adhyasa of being separate individuals or, as Visisjtadvaitins would have it, as multiple atmas separate from Brahman, this passage is sufficient to refute the proposition that jivatmas retain their identity as separate entities even in the state of moksha. That consciousness is only one and though, conditioned by the body-mind complex, it may appear as many, when the conditioning ceases, the apparent many merges in the one original consciousness is well illustrated by the salt water example in Brhadaranyaka IV.v.13.

3. As regards refutation of atmas being parts of Brahman there are specific Sruti statements that Brahman is divisionless (without parts) ("*nishkalam*") (Kaivalya 23, Swetasvatara 6.19, Mundaka 2.2.9 (in some texts, it is 2.2.10), 3.1.8, Brahma 1, Brahmabindu 21, Dhyabnabindu 13,

Nadabindu 17) “It should be realised in one form only” (Brhadaranyaka 4.4.20) (Sankaracarya’s commentary – “It should be realised in one form only, viz., as homogenous pure consciousness. Without any break in it, like space.”). Brhadaranyaka IV.iv.13 “As a lump of salt is without exterior or interior, entire, and purely saline in taste, even so is the atma without interior or exterior, entire and pure consciousness. It acquires particular consciousnesses on account of the association with (the products of) the elements (body-mind complexes). When a body mind complex is destroyed, this particular consciousness is destroyed. When the body falls, there is no longer any particular consciousness”. Brhadaranyaka IV.iii.7 -“’Which is the atma?’. ‘This infinite entity (purusha) that is identified with the intellect and is in the midst of the organs, the light within the heart, *hrdayantarjyotih*. Assuming the likeness – i.e., the likeness of the intellect, it moves between two worlds; it thinks., as it were, and shakes, as it were’”.) In his commentary, Sankaracarya says, “..’*Vijanamaya*’, identified with the intellect; atma is so called because of our failure to discriminate its association with its limiting adjunct (*upadhi*), the intellect, for it is perceived as associated with the intellect….. ‘Within the heart’;….heart, here, means the intellect, which has its seat in the heart……The word, ‘within’ indicates that the atma is different from the modifications of the intellect. Atma is called light, because it is self-effulgent, for, through this light, the self-effulgent atma, this aggregate of body and organs – i.e.,the body-mind complex - goes out and works, as if it were sentient, like the shining of a jar placed in the sun .Or like an emarald or any other gem dropped into milk etc imparts its lustre to the milk etc., so does the effulgent atma….. imparts its lustre to the body and organs, including the intellect. …..The intellect being clear (*svacca*) and close to the atma, easily catches the reflection of the atma…..next comes the manas which catches the reflection of the atma through the intellect; and lastly the body through the organs”. ……That is why, depending on the degree of discrimination, each one identifies himself with one or other component of the body mind complex……’It thinks as it were’; By illumining the intellect, which does the thinking, atma, through its self-effiulgent light that pervades the intellect…..seems to think. ……Hence the people think that the atma thinks but really it does not.”

Section 54 - World being Real Effect Refuted

Visishtadvaitins and Dwaitins say that the world is as real as Paramatma .In the earlier portions we have already discussed, how, in the light of various Sruti statements, such a view would be illogical.

Section 55 - Refutation of Brahman Being Saguna

4. As regards the Dwaita and Visishtadvaita thesis that Brahman is *saguna* (one with attributes) the Advaitin replies that to have attributes is to be limited. To be small is not to be big. To be good is to be not bad. Exclusion is limitation. If Brahman is credited with any attributes, we would be making Brahman a limited entity. To be limited, entity wise, Brahman has to be attributeless ("*nirguna*"). Svetasvatara Upanishad 6.11 specifically says that Sakshi (Brahman) is "nirguna". This occurs also in Brahma Upanishad 3. Nrsimhaottarataapani says "*aguna"*. Apart from this, there are numerous passages which talk of Brahman being free of attributes, mentioning specific attributes – vide Mundaka 2.1.2 – " formless, without vital force and without mind"*;* Katha *1.3.15* – soundless, touchless, colourless, odourless"; Katha 1.2.22 – " without vital airs and without mind"*;* Mundaka 1.1.6 – "without features, eyes and ears; which has neither hands nor feet" Brhadaranyaka 3.8.8 – "neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, neither red colour nor oiliness, neither shadow nor darkness.....neither flavour nor odour, without eyes or ears, without the vocal organ or mind, ...without the vital force nor the mouth.." – Prasna 4.10 – "Shadowless, bodiless, colourless" All these go against the proposition that Brahman is endowed with attributes. Mandukya 7 makes it clear that Brahma caitanyam is not the objectifying consciousness ("*Na prajnam*" – Sankaracarya's commentary – "By 'na prajnam' is denied the awareness of everything by a single act of consciousness; i.e. dharmabhoota jnanam is negated.) The interpretation of Visishtadvaitins that "nirguna" means that Lord Narayana who is Brahman, is devoid of all evil and has only all auspicious attributes (*sarvakalyanagunaakaara*), we have the Kathopanishad mantra 1.2.14 which says that

Brahman is beyond *dharma* as well as *adharma* (virtue as well as vice). As Sureswacarya points out, the distinction between the sacred and the profane is meaningful only in the vyavaharika plane.

5. What has been said above is sufficient to refute the view (of Visishtadvaitins and Dwaitins that the Supreme Being is not only swaroopa jnanam but He has, as one of His attributes, *visesha jnanam* (what they call *dharma jnanam)* and they talk of Brahman as omniscient (sarvajna) etc. . Any knowledge, even omniscience, involves triputi - and to make Brahman a pramaata entertaining perception or thought of objects (prameyam) involves pramanam (knowing instruments). This will not be in accordance with Sruti statements that Brahman is amanah. The word "sarvajna" is not applicable to Brahman because Brahman is non-dual (advayam) and there is no second entity for It to know. Cf. Chandogya Upanishad 7.24.1 – "The Infinite is that where one does not see anything else, does not hear anything else and does not know anything else".

Section 56 - Moksha Only After Death" Refuted

Dwaitins and Visishtadvaitins say that liberation (moksha) happens for a successful spiritual seeker only after death. But, as shown in Part II, in the section, entitled "Liberation in this life itself – Jivanmukti", there are a number of Upanishadic passages which establish that a person who gains knowledge of jiva brahma aikyam is free of samsara, that is, gets moksha, in the very life in which he gains the knowledge.

Section 57 - Moksha by Negation of Jivas Is Not Futile

Visishtadvaitins say that in Advaita, since *moksha* involves negation of jivas, *moksha* is a futile attainment; jiva himself is not there to enjoy moksha. The answer is that when we talk of jivatma as bound and liberated, of the mixture of Brahma caitanyam in the form of pratyagatma and ahamkara. What we say is destroyed on attainment of moksha is the

ahamkara. The pratyagatma, which is non-different from Brahma caitanyam, is not destroyed. Once there is videhamukti, there is no longer any need to use two terms. All that there is is Brahma caitanyam, the infinite consciousness. The Advaitin's moksha is discovery of Brahmatvam as a jivanmukta and, in videhamukti, being Brahma Itself. What more does one want than being the Existence-Consciousness-Infinity?

(The contention of Visishtadvaitins mentioned above is based on their failure to distinguish the atma from ahamartha.

Section 58 - Misinterpretation Of Avarana Sakti Of Maya

1. Visishtadvaitins refer to the Advaita doctrine of avidya and say that the covering of consciousness, which is the essential nature of Brahman, means the e loss of Brahman itself. This misconception has to be corrected from many angles. One is that the covering is not for Brahman, but for jivas; it is like sun being covered by a cloud and one is unable to see the sun from the earth. So, when avidya exerts the avarana sakti, it is the jiva who is unable to have a vision of Brahman. For Brahman, there is no avidya at all. Avidya is mithya (a lower order of reality) and it cannot affect the paaramaarthika, Brahman. We do say that avidya is located in Brahman, because any mithya entity must have a sub-stratum for it to appear. The snake cannot appear unless there is a snake. We have to have some location for Maya. Since there is no other go, we say that Maya is located in Brahman. Being located itself is mithya. There is no Maya at all, as far as Brahman is concerned. Location is only from the point of view of the jiva. There is no real snake located on the rope. It is only for the on-looker in semi-darkness that a snake appears to be located on what he sees as an object, without understanding its nature in full; if you imagine the snake to be a conscious entity, it would not see a snake at all. Like that jivatmas are aware of the existence of a conscious entity within themselves, but are not aware that that conscious entity is the

infinite consciousness. So, they regard themselves as limited beings. Therefore there is no question of the swayamprakasatvam of Brahman being destroyed by avidya.

6. Secondly, the Visishtadvaitin's argument proceeds on the basis of equating Brahman and knowledge and avidya and ignorance and saying that ignorance is opposed to knowledge. But Advaita makes a distinction between *swaroopa jnanam* and *vritti jnanam*. Secondly avidya itself is not ignorance; it is a power that engenders ignorance. Brahman is knowledge (jnanam) in nature not in the sense of vritti jnanam but swaroopa jnanam. What are opposed to each other are not swaroopa jnanam and ignorance but vritti jnanam and ignorance. In fact, on the vyavaharika plane, swaroopa jnanam (Brahma caitanyam) illumines ignorance as well as knowledge; through the conditioning of the intellect or reflection in the intellect illumines the ignorance of brahmatvam caused by avidya as well as the knowledge of aham brahma asmi imbibed through Sastra. Swaroopa jnanam (Brahma caitanyam) is eternal (nityam). Vide Brahadaranyaka IV.iii.23 - The vision of the witness can never be lost, because it is imperishable (*Na hi drashturdrsherviparilopo vidyate avinaasitvaat*). Further, since Brahman is eternal, the critic can be hoisted on his own petard. If an eternal Brahman of the nature of knowledge is opposed to ignorance of the nature of avidya, avidya would have been destroyed at the very outset and there would no jivas at all ignorant of their nature as Brahman.

2. Thirdly, the opponents cannot ignore the Advaita doctrine that Brahman is satyam and avidya is mithya. Mithya cannot affect satyam. Therefore, there is no question of avidya destroying Brahman.

Section 59 - Meaning Of Jivatma Being Resolved In Brahman In sushupti

In sushupti, jivatma is said to be resolved in Paramatma (Brahman). This should not be taken literally, because the aavarana sakti of moola avidya (Maya) is not destroyed.

Vikshepa sakti is suspended, but the avarana sakti is still maintaining Brahma ajnaanam (ignorance of Brahmatvam) in the resolved antahkarana. So, unless he is a jnaani, when a person wakes up, he does so with Brahma ajnaanam and the consequent adhyaasa. In sushupti on account of temporary suspension of identification with upadhis, the distraction by the world created by the vikshepa sakti of Maya is not there. Adhyasa engendered by the avarana sakti comes into play only when the world created by the vikshepa sakti is there as the premeyam. Since the pramaata is resolved in sushupti, there is no premeyam for the person in sushupti. So, there is no adhyaasa for the time being and samsara is suspended for the nonce. When the person wakes up, he says, "I slept happily; I did not know anything". The absence of cognition of external objects and of internal cognition is registered mechanically in the resolved antahkarana (antahkarana in karana avastha). Ananda (happiness) is also registered. The source of the ananda is the ananda swaroopam (the anantatvam) of atma. Since the resolved antahkarana is in a calm state, the atma ananda is reflected in it without it being aware of it at that time and that is registered by the resolved antahkarana. In technical language, there is a sukshma vritti in them antahkarana, called avidya vritti pertaining to non-experience of external objects, to the absence of internal disturbance and to happiness. (When the vritti is taking place, the person is not aware of it but vritti is taking place). Otherwise, we cannot explain the ability of the person to say, on waking up," I slept happily; I did not know anything" (*sukham aham asvaaptam na kincit avedisham*). What was not registered cannot be recollected. By arthapatti pramanam, we know that atma caitanyam had illumined sukham in the kaarana sariram during sushupti. We also know that the original consciousness (atma caitanyam) as well as ajnaanam (ignorance of Brahmatvam) continues to exist in sushupti.

Section 60 - Meaning Of The Words Used In Sastra Depends On The Context

1. Jivatma, inseparably until videha mukti, is a mixture of (a) the all pervading consciousness (b), the reflecting medium, the antahkarana and (c) the reflected consciousness. The word, “Jivatma” means, in different contexts a different combination of these three. When Mundaka Upanishad is interpreted as referring to Jivatma and paramatma as two birds sitting in the tree, one eating the fruit and the other looking on, “Jivatma” means the mixture of (b) and (c). When in Chandogya Upanishad 6.3.3, Brahman is said to have entered into the three deities as jivatma, “jivatma” should be taken as (c). When the jnani says “I, the jivatma, am Brahman”, jivatma" means (a). When Sastra talks of travel of jivatma, after death, to other lokas and of rebirth, Jivatma means the mixture of (b) and (c).

2. When it is said that there is no world other than Brahman, the reference is to brahmasatyam jaganmithya. When it is said that Brahman is free of the world, the reference is to the paramartika status of Brahman.

3. In Brahma Sutra, based on the six-fold criteria for finding the purport of the text, there are a number of discussions how various words should be interpreted. Examples are ‘praana’ and ‘aakasa’ which in certain contexts refer to Brahman.

Section 61 - Mixing Up Orders Of Reality

One should not mix up orders of reality. Suppose, one convicted of murder pleads, “Atma neither kills nor is it killed. I am Atma, so, I did not kill and, therefore, you should not punish me.” The judge would turn round and say “I am not punishing your Atma; I shall punish only your body.” It is in this strain that Ramakrishna Paramahamsa relates a story of a man thinking that the elephant is atma and I am atma and so, the elephant cannot kill me. So saying he goes and lays himself in front of a rogue elephant. The body of the elephant comes and crushed the body of the man.

Section 62 - Guru and Brahman synonymous

A Jivanmukta identifies himself with Brahman. On the vyavaharika plane, he is looked upon as Iswara. That is why guru is glorified as Paramatma in the famous sloka "gururbrahma gururvishnu gururdevo maheswara; gurureva parambrahma tasmai sri gurave namaha". Correspondingly, when a devotee does namaskara to a guru, the guru accepts it with the thought that the devotee is doing namaskara, not to the guru's body, but to Iswara or to the atma jnanam in the guru.

Section 63 - Who is a Brahmana?

Brahadaranyaka Upanishad III.v.1, IV.iv.22 and IV.iv.23 use the word, "Brahmana" for those who utilize karma yoga to attain purity of mind, pursue jnana yoga and know Brahman. . In the Jabala Upanishad, the sage Atri asks Yajnavalkya, "May I ask you, Yajnavalkya, how is one without the sacred thread a Brahmana? Yagnavalkya replied, "The conviction 'I am the atma' alone is his sacred thread." Vajrasucika Upanishad discusses 'Who is a Brahman? It says that a Brahmana is not a Brahman because of his caste or his learning, or his righteousness but by perceiving the atma directly (*aparoksha jnanam*). In the Bhagawadgita, Lord Krishna talks of *jaati braahmanas,* persons born in a family of the brahmana caste*, karma braahmanas*, persons who are engaged in noble activates and *guna btraahmanas*, the seekers or accomplishers of jivabrahma-aikya jnanam. There is no virtue in being merely a jaati Brahmana; the karma Brahmana deserves respect; the highest aspiration is to be a guna Brahmana. There is a sloka which says that at birth one is *sudra,* becomes *dwija* by noble action, *vipra by learning* and *braahmana* by knowing Brahman. ('Sudra' indicates self-ignorance, 'dwija' refers to one initiated for the pursuit of studies, 'vipra' refers to a learned man and 'brahmana' refers to the knower of Brahman.

Section 64 - Process Of Cognition

When I say, “I know this,” the “I”, the “know” and “this” are not simultaneously cognized. Each piece of knowledge requires a triputi – a pramata, pramanam and prameya (or, to put in another version, a *karta* , karanam and *karma*). E.g. “I know the tree”. Tree becomes the object of knowledge . When tree is the object of knowledge neither ‘I” nor the act of knowing can be the object of knowledge. . When “I” is the object of knowledge, neither “tree” nor the act of knowing can be the object of knowledge. When the act of knowing is the object of knowledge, neither “I” nor “tree” can be the object of knowledge. “I”, “know” and “tree” - each requires, separately, a knower, knowing and known. So the awareness of “I’, “know” and “tree” takes place successively, through a separate triputi in each case – such as “I know the tree”, “I know the act of knowing” and “ I know the I that knows the tree”, but so quickly that it appears to be simultaneous.

Section 65 - Five-fold Pramanas

1. Knowledge (“prama”) is obtained by five fold pramanaas – “pratyaksha”, “anumaana”, “upamaana”, “sabda”, “arthaapatti” and “anupalabdhi”.

   (i) Pratyaksha Pratyaksha is direct cognition, external as well as internal. E.g., I know that there is a flower pot out there in the garden; I see it. Or I know that nadasvaram is being played in the far distance, even though I can't see it; I hear it. I know that a rose has bloomed in the neighbor’s garden beyond the wall; I smell it. My eyes are closed; someone puts sugar in my mouth; I know it is sugar because the taste is similar to sugar which I have tasted before. I know that there is fire in the fire place even when my back is turned towards the fire because I feel the heat on my skin. If anger arises in my mind I know it.

   (ii) Anumaana is knowledge by inference. Inference is ascertainment of the existence of a thing we come to know even though it is not perceived (called “saadhyam”) because of the existence of a thing that is perceived (called “hetu”) on the basis of the previous experience of the invariable

concomitance of these two things (called “vyaapti”). E.g., I see only smoke rising on the top of the mountain; I know from previous experience, say, observation of what happens in the yaagssaala (sacrificial hall) or in the kitchen that whenever there is smoke there is fire; so, I come to the conclusion that there is fire in the mountain.

(iii) Upamaana. Upamaana is knowledge obtained by comparison, where features similar to a thing which one already knows are observed in a freshly observed thing. E.g., a person goes to a forest and sees a “gavaya” (a species of ox). He observes similarity between that animal and the cow in his house. Then he has the cognition “My cow is similar to a gavaya” These are cases of similarity of entities which are not identical.

(iv) Sabda . The distinctive (exclusive) means of knowledge by sabda , i.e., verbal testimony is called “sabdapramaana”. When the statement gives information that is not already known and for which its syntactical relation that is purportful is not sublated by other evidence, that statement is sabdapramaana. (Vide Vedanta Paribhasha). The pramaana excludes absurd statements like “Let it be made wet by fire”. The knowledge arising from verbal testimony should be above contradiction by any other valid pramaana like pratyaksha. Sabda pramana is of two kinds - that which is in the form of written or spoken testimony of a trustworthy person (*aapta*) and that which is impersonal (*apaurusheya*), viz., sruti (Vedic testimony).

2. “For the study of sastra, the criteria of valid knowledge (*pramanam*) are that (i) it should produce knowledge (*pramaa janakatvam*), (ii) the content should be something that is not already known through any other means of valid knowledge (‘not already known’ except recollection) (*pramanaantara-anatigatatvam*), (iii) it should be free of ambiguity (*asandigdhwatvam*), (iv) it should not sublated by another valid means of knowledge (*abaadhitvam*) and (v) it should be have utility (*arthavatvam, prayojanatvam*). The purport of a topic has be ascertained by six criteria – (i) the concordance of what is taught in the beginning and what is taught in the end (*upakarama-upasamhaara-ekaroopam*), (ii) what is repeatedly

taught (*abhyaasa)* (iii) what is not already known by other valid pramaana (*apoorvata*) (iv) what contains a statement of the benefit of the teaching (*phalam*) (v) what is praised and the opposite of what is condemned (*arthavaada*) and (vi) what is logically acceptable (*upapatti*). For example, we ascertain that the purport of the sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad is to teach about Brahman

(i) from the passage in the beginning ,"All that there is here is atma" "*etat aatmyam-idam-sarvam*" according with the passage at the end, "That is the Reality. That is atma" "*Tat-satyam tat-aatma*"

(ii) the repetition of the sentence, "Thou art That" ("*Tattvamasi*") nine times in 6.8.7 etc

(iii) the fact that the identity of jivatma and paramatma is not known from any other pramanam

(iv) the statement "For a man who, having a teacher, acquires knowledge in this world, the delay is for as long only (as the remaining prarabdha is exhausted). Then be becomes merged in Existence." "(*Aacaaryavaan Purusha veda. Tasya taavat-eva ciram yaavat-na vimokshye atha sampathsye*" (6.14.2)

(v) The praise of a knower of Brahman and the condemnation of the ignorant by the example of a man who mutters a lie being burnt by the fire compelled to be kept in the hand, as test in olden days, and the one who spoke truth not being burnt, to demonstrate the rebirth of the ignorant and the merging of the knower in Brahman (6.16.1-3) and

(vi) the demonstration that there is no substance in the form of the world, the effect , other than Brahman, the cause through the example of the clay and pots, jars etc.

3. Anupalabdhi. In this non-cognition of a thing serves as pramaana. This applies in the case of objects which would ordinarily be capable of being perceived by positive means of cognition, had they existed in the locus in which they are not perceived now. In other words, when all the conditions for the perception x is present, and yet x is not perceived, such non-perception would lead to a true cognition of the absence of x. For example, there is a garden in which there are flower pots; among the flower pots, normally, there is a pot with a beautiful rose. One day when I look out from my widow, I do not see the flower pot with the rose. Therefore, I conclude that

there is non-existence of the flowerpot with the rose in the garden. (Only by anupalabdhi pramaana, the details pertaining to one ritual, for example, are known to be not the same as the details of some other ritual. Certain details which do not belong to a particular ritual can only be known by this pramanam).

Section 66 - Duties Of A Householder: Grahastha, Asrama and Dharma

Threefold duties –

(1) Fivefold yajna (sacred duties) – (a) Deva yajna , i.e. Vedic sacrifices pertaining to the worship of deities, (b) Rishi yajna , i.e., adhyayana (chanting) and study of Veda, (c) Pitr yajna, i.e., rituals pertaining to worship of ancestors who are supposed to have gone to one of the upper lokas, called pitr loka, on account of their punya, (d) Manushya yajna i.e., service to humanity and (e) bhoota yajna i.e., promotion of the welafre of the animal and plant kingdom and respect for nature and ecology-

(2) Daana (charity) (if material assistance is beyond one's resources, one should impart knowledge to those who need it) and tapas (austerity in life, aparigraha -not acquiring wealth and other things beyond what is required for sustenance of oneself and one's family and the requirements of yagna and sama dama, restraint in speech, thought and action, not causing physical or mental hurt to others which involves, inter alia, adherence to satyam, i.e, truthfilness which should be hitam and priyam and ahimsa (non-violence). Examples for satyam that is hitam and priyam - Suppose that your son is taking to evil ways. You have to advise him. You have to tell him what is the correct way of life but you should not scold him while doing so. Suppose an innocent person fleeing from persons trying to murder him has taken refuge in your house and those people come and ask you whether he is in your house; you should not disclose the fact that he is in your house; you should, dodge the

people who are searching him. What is *dharma (*righteousness) should be the guiding factor.

Section 67 - Pratyabhinja

(This is a condensed version of a topic already discussed in the main paper)

We generally refer to ourselves with the help of the 'I' thought. Oneself revealed through the I thought is of three types. One I is the I experienced at present. This presently experienced I is the ahamkara. The second type is the I which oneself had experienced in the past and which is remembered now. This I which had been experienced in the past and which is remembered now is also the ahamkara. But there is a third I. This is a recognized I. This occurs in the form of the expression, "The I that I had experienced in the past and the I that I that is experienced now are the same I." The Sanskrit word for recognition is *pratyabhijna*. The I experienced in the past and the I that is experienced at present are different in terms of place, time and attributes. For example, the past I was experienced at Chennai in the year 1935 and the present I is experienced at New Delhi in the year 1975. At Chennai, in 1935, the I belonged to a young and cheerful but immature student. At New Delhi, the I belongs to an old man, saddened by many tragedies but wise by virtue of various experiences. In technical language, the *vacyaartha* of the past I and the *vacyaartha* of the present I do not tally. But I still equate the past I and the present I when I do the recognition and say that the Chennai I is the same as the New Delhi I. In any situation when this happens, we have take recourse to *lakshyaartha*. (Vacyaartha is the literal meaning. Lakshyartha is the implied meaning). When we take recourse to lakshyartha, in this case, we adopt the method called *bhaagatyaaga lakshanaa*, that is, we discard the features that do not tally and retain the aspect which tallies to make the equation valid. Now the features to be discarded are the youth, cheerfulness and immaturity of the past I and the old age, sadness and wisdom of the present I. What

remains is the conscious being devoid of the differences of place, time and attributes. This conscious being I refer to in equating the past I and the present I validly after discarding the different features is not the ahamkara but the sakshi. Ahamkara is consciousness associated with attributes. Sakshi is consciousness devoid of attributes. One's real nature is not the ahamkara but the sakshi. The presently experienced and the past remembered I are the ahamkara. The recognized I is the sakshi. The recognition doesn't necessarily have to be distant in time, place and attributes. Even when I do the recognition by saying I who listened to the Gita bhashyam class yesterday am the same I who am listening to the Mundaka bhashyam today, even here, the recognized I is not the ahamkara but the sakshi.

Section 68 - Vedic Support for Possession by Spirits

In Brhadaranyaka 4.3.1, there is Vedic support for saying that people can   possessed by spirits. Bhujyu says to Yajnavalkya that when he and some others went to the Madra kingdom, they went to the house of Patancala and saw that his daughter was possessed by a *gandharva*.

Section 69 - Conversion of secular events into religious ceremonies

In Hinduism, the important events in a persons life are regarded as religious ceremeonies. Cremation of the dead body is treated as the last holy sacrifice (yajna), the dead man conducts. Since the body is dead, the son conducts this yagna on the behalf of the deceased. The woman is regarded as the sacred fire (agni) in which the gods are invoked to offer the seed and out of that offering the human being is born (Brhadaranyaka 5.2.13. The nuptial is called 'garbha-daana-yagna'.Brhadaranyaka 5.4.20 gives the mantra to be uttered – "He embraces her saying, "I am the prana, you are the speech; you are speech, and I am prana. I am the sama veda and you are the rg.veda. I am heaven, and you are the earth' This mantra

is meant to engender harmony in the relationship of the husband and wife. The sexual union of the husband and wife is undertaken as a sacred act for producing good children. It is called *vaajapeya yaga*. In the mantra connected with it, the husband invokes Hiranyagsarbha to enter him, In what is called *sthanadaana* mantra, when the husbands hands over the baby to be suckled by the mother, he implores Saraswati, the goddess of learning to enter the mother and feed the child. In what is called the *naamakararana* cermony, the father gives the child a secret name and that name is 'Veda'. Here, the word, 'veda' means caitanyam, The father says ' You are caitanyam', i.e., 'you are none other than brahman'.So, as soon as the child is born, 'Tattvamasi' is injected into the child, hoping that when he grows up, he will understand ' ahambrahmasmi'. In the *karma-japa* ceremony, the father utters the word, '*vaak*' three times in the child's right ear. Vak represents veda . Three times to say 'let rg.veda enter the child and purify it' 'let yajur veda enter the child and purify it' and 'let sama veda enter the child and purify it'. In the iannapaasana icweremony, the child is fed curd, honey and ghee and the father says, when he feeds curd, 'I am giving you bhoo-loka', when he feeds honey, he says' I am giving you bhuvarloka' and when he feeds ghee, he says' I am giving you suvaarloka" ; It iis an expression of good wishes formthe childmto possess everything in life. At the time of delivery, the father does *prokshana' (*sprinkles wate*r)*praying to prana-devata, so that *praasootika vaayu* would effect easy delivery – "O, Indra – referring to prana devata – from the mother who is the ocean bring out the child like the waves without destroying the mother'. A homa (sacrificial fire ceremony) is done even before the umbilical cord is cut; the fathe\er keeps the baby on his lap and prays to various devatas for the longevity, healthy life, prosperity and continuity of the cultural and spiritual tradition. In Brhadaranyaka mantra 6.4.28, the father glorifies the child, 'You have out-shone your father and your grand-father. Younhave reached the extreme limit of attainment through your splendour, fame and brahmavarchas (brahaamanical power). The husband also thanks the wife, "You have donne a great job. You have given us a child'. Eating food is called *prsaana-agnihotra*' and bits of cooked rice

are put in the mouth as offering to the five aspects of prana - prana, apana, vyana, udana , samana – and the eating is regarded as offering to *vaisvanara devata*, the presiding deity of digestion.

Section 70 - IIness Looked Upon As Tapas

Brhadaranyaka V.xi.1 advises us to look upon illness as an opportunity to practice austerity or penance (*tapas*). 'Tapas' means willfully subjecting the body to discomfort or pain. adopting an attitude of prayer. It is a training to do without comforts, to develop the capacity to bear the opposites of material conditions and facilities with equanimity and get a sense of self-satisfaction when the attempt is successful. In this mantra, by the words, "pretam agnou abhyaavahadhati' cremation is indicated as the proper funeral for a grahastha's dead body. If illness one knows will send in death, one is advised to look upon the journey of the dead body as vanaprastha asrama.

Section 71 - Meaning of "Saakshi-Bhashyam"

We come across statements in the Sastra that that our mind is illumined by sakshi (is *saakshi-bhaasyam*). . Similarly it is said that the dream world is sakshi-bhasyam. Sakshi is not the knower-consciousness. 'Illumines' means 'made known'. So, we cannot attribute any act of knowing to sakshi. So, what we mean by saying that sakshi illumines or witnesses the mind and by saying that the sakshi illumines or witnesses the dream is that in the presence of sakshi, cidabhasa is formed in the mind and cidabhasa pervades the vrittis in the mind and by that process, objects of the external world or objects of the dream world mistaken to exist outside the mind are perceived.. Similarly, when we say that our mind is self-evident, what we mean is that as and when a thought arises, cidabhasa pervades it and that is how we become aware of our own thoughts The example for the expression 'sakshi illumines the mind' or' sakshi illmines the dream' is the sun and the reflected sunlight. The

mirror is bright on account of the reflected sunlight but we do not say that the reflected sunlight illumines the mirror; we say that the sun illumines the mirror.

Section 72 - Philosophical Interpretation of Rg. Veda

1. (a). Hinduism is not pantheism or animism or paganism. If we go by Visishtadvaita or dwaita, it is monotheism. For Visishtadvaita the universe and the souls of living beings with separate consciousness of their own are the body of the One Supreme Being personified as Lord Narayana. For Dwaita, the universe and the living beings are separate from Lord Narayana and the living beings are dependent souls. But if we go by Advaita Vedanta, Hinduism is not even monotheism. It is centred on one and only all pervading Supreme Being of the nature of Existence- Consciousness- Infinity, called Brahman. This is not a personal God but a formless, attributeless, all pervading, non-dual entity, identical with consciousness of living beings. The world that is experienced which includes the bodies and minds of human beings world is a combination of the all pervading Existence aspect of Brahman and unreal names and forms superimposed on It. by an unreal power called Maya. Even this is there only on the empirical plane. On the plane of absolute reality, i.e., for Brahman, there is no world at all there is no world at all. The intelligent cause that visualises creation and guides Maya is Iswara, an unreal semblance of Brahman-consciousness in Maya. Owing to Maya's power of veiling and projecting, living beings, ignorant of their true nature as Brahman, regard themselves as limited individuals, separate from Brahman, the outer world and other individuals and undergo a cycle of action, enjoyment, suffering, births and deaths, called samsara. Liberation from samsara consists in the realisation of their identity with Brahman. The knowledge of identity with Brahman requires an undisturbed, concentrated mind. Spiritual practices to refine the mind consist of worship of and meditation on Iswara. But since Iswara also is not a personal god and only a principle, scriptures provide a variety of forms as symbols of Iswara in various cosmic aspects. The Rg Vedic hymns are addressed to such deities. If they

are worshipped with the notion that they are real gods, it becomes polytheism. But if they are worshipped as symbolic representations of Iswara, it becomes the spiritual practice to refine the mind.

(b) The Vedas in four compilations called Rg., Yajur, Sama and Atharva Veda), in not very clearly demarcated divisions called Samhitas, Brahmanas, Aranyakas and Upanishads. Samhitas are hymns (mantras) in praise of deities (*devas*). Brahmanas are commentaries on the mantras and description of sacrifices to be performed along with the chanting of mantras in praise of the devas... Upanishad is the philosophical portion, at the last part of the Vedas. Aranyakas stand between Brahmanas and Upanishads and contain portions partaking of the nature of both but is generally regarded as Vedic literature relating to Upasana (meditation). (For example, Aitereya Aranyaka 3.2.3 – "This is this Paramatma indeed that the votaries of the Rg. veda meditate upon in the great Ukhta, the Adhvaryus in fire, the Chandogas in Mahavrata; Him in the heaven, Him in the Akasa, Him in the waters; in the osadis; in all beings. That One they call Brahman".)

2. (a) The misconception that Hinduism is polytheistic arose from the interpretation of the Vedic gods as real enmities. Madwacarya selected about forty hymns of the Rg. Veda and formulated a philosophical interpretation of the Vedic hymns. This approach was adopted later by Swami Dayananda Saraswati and Aurobindo. In a recent Malayalam treatise, called 'Tattvamasi', on the same lines, Sukumar Azhikode has shown that the Samhitas are the forerunners of the philosophy of the Upanishads. The divinities (*devas, devatas*) to whom mantras are addressed are not personal gods but the ancient rishis' poetic description of the One Supreme Being and Its manifestation as the cosmos. The negation of any idea of personalisation is evidenced by the fact that Vedic mantras equate all deities with the one Supreme Being and where when any one deity is praised the mantras talk of that deity as all deities or as the universe or as pervading the universe or as controlling the universe, as shown below.

(b). Dirghtamas sukta (Rg. veda.1.164.46) - . "They call this deity Indra, Mitra, Agni, the divine Suparna and Garuda). That which is one and which is Existence the wise call by many names (*ekam sat vipra bahudha vadanti*) - as Agni, Yama, Matarisvan etc. (The same idea occurs in Yaska's Nirukta (7.4) – "The one only atma is worshipped in many names. All the deities are like limbs of the one Atma".) Sukla Yajurveda (Vajaneya samhita) 32.1 known as Tadeva sukta (That alone hymn) - " Agni is that, Aditya is That, Vayu is That, Chandramas is That, Light is That, Brahma is That, ……". Atharva Veda 13.4.20-21 - "To him who knows this God simply as One. Neither second nor third nor fourth is He called. Neither fifth nor sixth nor seventh. Neither eighth nor ninth nor tenth is He called. He oversees all – what breathes and what breathes not. To Him goes the conquering (supreme) power; He is the One, the One alone. In Him all deities become One alone" Skambasukta (10.7.) and Uccishtasukta (11.7) of Atharva Veda talk of the One Supreme Power. Skambasukta says that the knowledge of all the devatas is the same. Rg. veda 3.55 says repeatedly in 22 mantras that the divinity of all the deities and their greatness are the same. This sukta reveals the only one all pervading caitanyam by which lightning flashes, plants blossom, the sun rises and sets. In Rg. Veda 10.114. 4-5. The seer's poetic imagination sees the atma as the auspicious-winged bird (*suparna*) which pervades the whole universe and repeats the statement that the one is imagined by the saints as many. Rg. mantra 4.40.5 which talks of *hamsa* referring to Aditya says that he exists as the light for the earth, as vayu in the antariksha and as the consciousness caitanyam in man. And ends with the statement "you are the only reality and the creator of waters, of rays, of truth and mountains". Rg. Veda 8.52.2 talks of Agni, Surya and Dawn (*Ushas*) being the same and repeats the seminal Vedic refrains of the one appearing as many. Rg. Veda 3.5.4 talks of Agni becoming Mitra, Varuna and Vayu . Rg. Veda 3.54.8 – "One that is all (*visvam ekam*) is the Lord of the moving and the steady, of what walks, what flies – this multiform creation". Rg Veda 1.89.10– "Aditi is the space, the antariksha, and the life source and support of all". Atharva veda 4.16– " Whatever a man does, whether he stands, or moves

secretly or lies down or gets up or whispers, Varuna knows Whatever transaction takes place, He is there as the third. This earth and the space are His. His two sides are the two oceans. At the same time, He is inherent in every drop of water. Varuna is omniscient – *sarvajna* – and the inner controller of all". Rg. mantra 1.2. 17 – " The entire universe is encompassed in the steps of Vishnu".

(c) There is also direct negation of the idea of deities being different entities. In Hiranyagarbha sukta, Rg. Veda 10.121.1-10, an intelligent seeker asks, "To which deity (*Deva*) are we to offer havis (*kasmai devaaya havishaa vidhema*)? The Deva who is the creator of all beings and is the support of heaven and earth and who alone was before creation, the Deva who is the source of life and consciousness, the Deva whose command all the gods obey, the Deva whose shadow is mortality and immortality?" The devatas of the sukta is "*kaha*", the word of interrogation – which means, in reality, there is no deity at all other than the Supreme Being.

(d) These are the forerunners of the Upanishad declaration that there is only one reality which manifests or appears as many unreal forms. . The negation of the multiplicity is explicit in the Upanishads. In Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 3.9.1-9, we have the Vigadha Yagnavalkya dialogue starting with the question, "How many deities are there?" and ending with the question and answer "Which is the one Deity?" "The vital force. It is Brahman, which is called Tyat (That)".Taittiriya Upanishad 1.5.1. "It is Brahman; it is the atma. The other gods are the limbs".Kathopanishad 2.2.2 – " As the moving (sun) He dwells in heaven; (as air) He pervades all and dwells in the inter-space (antariksha); as Fire He resides on the Earth; as Soma He stays in a jar; He lives among men. He lives among Gods; He dwells in Truth; He dwells in space; He is born in water. He takes birth from the Earth. He is born in the sacrifice; He emerges from the mountains; He is unchanging; He is great". Wherever non-ualism is spoken of, it goes without saying that there is nothing like many deities. Brhadaranyaka 4.4.19 (also Kathopanishad) 2.1.11- "*na iha naanaa asti kincana*).

He who sees differences, as it were, goes from death to death"; (Mandukya karika- "This birthless becomes differentiated through Maya, and it does in no other way than this. For should it become multiple in reality, the immortal will undergo mortality"); Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.1 "One only without a second (ekam *va advitiyam*). Chandogya 3.14.1 "All this is Brahman (*sarvam khalu idam Brahma*). Mandukya Upanishad 2. "All this is Brahman" (*sarvam hi etat Brahma*). Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 2.1.20 "The vital force is truth and It is the Truth of truth". Brhadaranyaka 4.4.20 – "It should be realised in one form only".

3. (a). In the priesthood dominated ritual oriented period of the Brahmanas, what, in the Samhitas, were figurative presentations of the all pervading Supreme Being and Its manifestation as the cosmos in the Samhitas got converted to physical performance of elaborate rituals involving offerings to various gods regarded as anthropomorphic persons with a view to acquiring wealth and prosperity on earth and a life of pleasure in heaven and, in Puranas, stories are woven around them. Offerings which started with ghee, milk and cooked cereals, passing through soma juice, deteriorated into meat involving the slaughter of animals, For example, the Asawamedha yagna of the Rg veda is the contemplation of atma caitanyam envisioned as effulgence. In the Brahmanas, Asawamedha yagna becomes a physical sacrifice in which the horse is slaughtered and the meat is offered to the deities. Still later, more than 350 domestic animals and 250 wild animals were required.). Like that, not being able to understand the metaphysical significance of the question "kah" in Rg. Veda 10.121.1-10, the later authors of Brahmana verses interpreted "kah" to mean Prajapati and reserved a yajna called "*kaayam*" for this devata. .Similarly, where Rg. veda 1.140.1 talks of knowing the one who is pure, dispels darkness and rides in the white shining chariot, the implied meaning of which is the one and only atma caitanyam, Samana interprets it as a commandment to cover the sacrificial fire with firewood. In the same way, the Infinite Brahman, called Purusha, becomes, in

Puranas, Vishnu sleeping on the bed which is a serpent called Anantasesha in the milky ocean. The all pervading aspect of the Supreme Being is presented as the avatara, Vamana, covering the earth and heaven with two steps and Mahabali having cornered to offer his own head for the third step.

(b) In the Mahabharata, at the end of Asvamedhaparvam, 91st chapter, yajnas that involve violence are condemned. Rg. Veda 8.70.3 says that Indra cannot be reached by yajna karma. Even in the Brahmanas and Aranyakas, we come across references, presumably belonging to their earlier phase, to atma and atmajnanam and denigration of actual performance of sacrifices. Taittiriya brahmana (3.10.8) says that atma is omnipotent. Aitereya second aranyakam starts with "This is the path, This is karma, This is Brahman, This is existence". The Satapatha brahmana (14,.3.2.1) which says that the atma of all beings is yagna echoes the Rg. Mantra (1.164.35) "yagna is the navel of the universe". Satapatha brahmana (2.2.4.7.8 . 10.5.3.3) specifies that, above all, yagna is meditation and it should be continued throughout life and, in 10.5.4, 16, it says that by physical yagna one cannot attain moksha. We see the denigration of rituals as kamya karma in passages such as in Chandogya 5.10.3 , Brhadaranyaka 3.8.10, Brahadaranyaka 4.4.10, Mundakopanishad 1.2.7-10. Isavasya Upanishad 9, etc. (Sacrifices and rituals that are denigrated refer to those done as kamya karma, sacrifices conducted for obtaining material benefits, here or heareafter and not the nitya naimittika karma performed as nishkama karma for acquiring purity of mind, as preparation for the pursuit of jnana yoga, cf. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.22).

4. (a) The Samhitas are the initial exposition of atma vidya in the symbolic and poetic language used by the seers who saw the invisible divine revelation and transmitted it to mankind. The Upanishads negated the ritualism of the Brahmanas and rejuvenated the sprouts of atma vidya of the Samhitas and gave direct, though often poetic, expression to atma vidya in all its range and subtlety. Upanishads shine as the loftiest metaphysical

expression of human thought in the form of the philosophy of atma vidya but the nucleus of it can be found in the Samhitas by any one who studies them in depth. (Satapatha Brahmana 10.3.5.12 talks of the Upanishads as the essence of the Vedas).

(b) The horse of the Asvamedha yagna of the Samhitas is not a four-legged animal. A deep study of the suktas of the Rg. veda 1.112.163, relating to the Asvamedha yagna will show that the sacrificial horse is nothing but a figurative description of effulgence which is how atma caitanyam is often referred to. To this we can juxtapose Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 1.1.1 – " The head of the sacrificial horse is the dawn, its eye the sun, its *prana* the air, its open mouth the fire called Vaisvanara, its body the year, its back the heaven, its belly the sky, its hoof the earth, its sides the four quarters, is ribs the intermediate quarters, its parts the seasons, its joints the months and fortnights, its feet the days and nights, its bones the stars, its flesh the clouds, its half-digested food is the sand, its blood-vessels the rivers, its liver and spleen the mountains, its hairs the herbs and trees. Its fore-part is the ascending sun, its hind-part is the descending sun, its yawning is the lightning, its shaking the body is the thundering, its making water the raining and its neighing is voice".

(c). In the Samhitas, we come across deities called Vishnu, Surya (Savita), Varuna, Agni, Indra etc. A deep study of the relevant suktas will show that they are not anthromorphic personalities but figurative and symbolic representation of the Supreme Being or Its aspects in cosmic manifestation. (In the Brahmanas, they become persons and in Puranas stories are built around them.) The meanings intended by the seers of the Samhitas will be clear if we go by Yaska's Nirukta which is a commentary on the Vedic terminology called Nikandu. According to Niruktam, "Vishnu" means the rays representing atma caitanyam pervading the universe; " Savita" means creator (of the universe); "Surya" means the Inner Controller inherent in all beings. The Surya of the Rg.veda 1.150.10 is not the physical sun but one who is beyond tamas and papa. If we go by Rg.veda 10.85.3, 10.85.4, 10.116.3, 1.1638.3, 1.179.5, 1.179.10, and 1.107.9 which talk of the Soma juice drunk by the knowers of

Brahman, as a thing to be drunk by the heart and as not a thing accessible to mere mortals, we will understand that the Soma juice prescribed as offering in sacrifice is not the juice of a creeper. According to Rg.veda 4.5.3,"Agni" is one who has gained the most secret knowledge. Cow (*go*) means rays. A comparative study of mantras 1, 2, and 3 of the 62nd sukta of the first mandala of the Rg veda and the 5th mantra and 18th mantra of the 23rd sukta of the second mandala will show that what the story of cows being stolen and hidden in a cave by an asura and the cow slaying the asura is the figurative expression of Ajnaanam (ignorance of one's true nature) being destroyed by atma jnanam (knowledge of the Supreme Being). This is also the meaning of the story of Vrtra being slain by Indra. Very often, we come across prayer for "*dravinam*". But what is referred is not secular wealth. Rg. veda 2.23.15 will show that the prayer is for the spiritual splendour obtained by atma-jnanam. In Rg. mantra 1.163.1 "horse" stands for the power of the intellect. The "Indra" of Rg. Mantra 8.92.2 is also atma jnanam that destroys ajnanam (knowledge of atma) that dispels ignorance. (The "Indra" of Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 2.5.19 we know is none other than Brahman itself.).

5. (a) Certain suktas of The Veda Samhitas anticipate the philosophy of the Upanishads, The rishi Dirghatamas says (Rg. Veda 1.125.5) that atma is *acittam* i.e. not accessible to human intellect – which means that atma cannot be comprehended as an external or internal object and can only be recognised intuitively as oneself. To this, we can juxtapose Taittiriya Upanishad 2.9.1 – "Words, along with the mind, return, unable to reach Brahman (yato vaco nivartante apraapya manasa saha)" and Kenopanishad 1.6 – "That which man does not comprehend with the mind (yat manasa na manute)" etc. In Yajurveda 31.2, there are mantras asserting the immanence as well as the transcendentalism of the Supreme Being; they talk of the Supreme Being being all pervading in the universe and at the same time being beyond space and time. The all pervasiveness and immanence are elaborately discussed in Brahadaranyaka Upanishad third chapter, eighth section and

transcendentalism can be seen in 3.9.26, 4.3.15 and 4.4.16, Kathopanishad 2.1.12-13, Mundaka 2.1.2 etc. In Advaita Vedanta, Brahman, the Existence-Consciousness-Infinity being the satya sub-stratum of the mithya nama roopa is immanence and advaitatvam and asangatvam are transcendentalism.

Ombhoorbhuvassuvah, tatsaviturvarenyam bhargo devasya dhimahi dhiyo nah pracodayaat - is a prayer. Superficially, it is an invocation of the Sun God (Suryadevata) – "We meditate upon that sacred effulgent Sun God who illumines (activates) all our intellects". But if we go by root-derivation and implied meaning (*lakshyartha*) of the words, we arrive at a philosophical interpretation – "Dhimahi" = We meditate upon. "Tat savitu varenyam" = the sacchidananda swaroopan of the creator of the universe. Tat = the Existence aspect ., Bargha = eflulgent (from 'bharjate' = that which burns down darkness, i.e. destroys ignorance) = the consciousness aspect . "Varenyam" = literally, that which is worth choosing by us, what is it that is chosen by all? Everyone chooses only ananda, poornatvam ; so ananda swaroopam. "Tat bhargo varenyam", together = sacchidananda swaroopam . (Of) " Savitu" = the creator (sooyate iti savita). "Devasya" = the Lord who is also the intelligent cause of the universe. "Tat savitu varenyam bhargo devasya", together, == the saccidananda swaroopam of that Lord, Iswara, who is both the material and intelligent cause of the universe). "Yah" = which saccidaananda swaroopam, "Pracodayat" = illumines (activates by giving satta and spoorti , existence and consciousness), Nah diyo" = our intellects . Thus, according to this interpretation, "tatsavituvarenyam bargho devasya" would indicate Brahma caitanyam and "diyo yo na prachoayat" would indicate atma caitanyam.. Thus the mantra would read "Let us meditate on that Brahman, who, as Iswara is the creator and whose nature is the existence-consciousness- infinity (sacchidananda), non-different from the consciousness of our own intellects which are illumined by Brahman)." And so, the prayer becomes an *abheda dyanam* .", with a meaning similar to that of mahavakyams like "prajnanam brahma" of Aitereya

Upanishad, "ayam atma brahma" of Mandukya Upanishad, "ahambrahmasmi" of Brhadaranyaka Upanishad and "tattvamasi" of Chandogya Upanishad.

(c) As already stated, Dirghatamas sukta (Rg. Veda 1.164.46) corresponds to Brhadaranyaka 4.4.19, though the Advaita Vedanta interpretation goes further and relegates the entire universe including all the gods and all other beings and even Iswara, to the category of mithya.

(i) Purusha sukta (Rg.veda 10.96, also in Atharva veda 19.6, also in Yajurveda Chapter 31) – "A thousand heads has He, the Purusha, also a thousand eyes and a thousand feet. He envelops the earth on all sides; He pervades it and is beyond it as far as ten fingers can count. ('Thousand' stands for 'countless' and 'being beyond as far as ten fingers' stands for 'transcendence'.). Purusha is this, entire all that has been in the past, all that is coming in the future and all that exists. He is the ruler of immortality. He is the totality of all beings.

What we see here is all the greatness of Purusha but yet there is more than this. One fourth of Him only evolves in the universe. Thence, as He spread in all directions, appeared all those creations that eat food and all those that eat not. Three fourth of Him rises above as the Infinite.

This Purusha shines like the sun beyond tamas. By knowing Him one becomes immortal. Other than knowing Him, there is no way of conquering mortality. Though unborn It appears to born in diverse ways." (When all pervasiveness and being the past and the future and transcending all are talked about, the reference is to immanence and transcendence of time, space and entity.) (In the eight Rk.of this sukta, creation is spoken of as the result of the yagna of the all pervading one (*Purusha*). The creation cycle is said to be endless.). "Both the Purushasukta and the Hiranyagarbhasukta (cited earlier) describe the Saguna form of Brahman pervading the universe, inhering in it and modifying into names and

forms. We can also see in them the idea of transcendental Brahman being the adhishtanam of the nama roopa.

(ii) To these we can juxtapose Brahadaranyaka 1.2.3 – "He (Virat) differentiated himself in three ways, making the sun the third form and air the third form. So this Prana (Virat) is divided in three ways. His head is the east and his arms that (north-east) and that (south-east). And his hind part is the west, his hip-bones that (north-west) and that (south-west), his sides the south and the north, his back heaven, his belly the sky, and his breast this earth. ...". Mundaka 2.1.4 – "The indwelling atma of all is surely He of whom heaven is the head. The moon and sun are the two eyes, the directions are the two ears, the revealed Vedas are the speech, air is the heart and it is He from whose two feet emerged the earth"; Mundaka Upanishad 2.2.11 – "All this is in front is but Brahman, the immortal. Brahman is on the right, as well as the left; above and below is extended Brahman alone. This world is nothing but Brahman, the highest." "Brhadaranyaka 1.4.7 - "It differentiated into name and form...... This Self has entered into these bodies...."; Mundaka 2.2.2 – " That ...... in which fixed all the worlds as well as the dwellers of the earth is this Immutable Brahman"; Mundaka 2.2.5 – "Know that atma alone that is one without a second, on which are strung heaven, the earth and the inter-space, the mind and the vital force together with all the other organs"; Chandogya Upanishad 7.1.3 – "I have heard from masters like you that he who knows Brahman transcends sorrow"; Kaivalya Upanishad 9 – "He alone is everything which is in the past, which is the present and which will be in the future. Knowing Him one overcomes mortality. There is no other path for liberation; Mundaka Upanishad 3.2.1 – " The wise ones who know this supreme abode, this Brahman, in which is placed this universe and which shines holy, having become desireless ....overcome rebirth"; Mundaka 3.2.8 – "As rivers, flowing down, become indistinguishable on reaching the sea by giving their names and forms, so also the illumined soul, having become freed from name and form, reaches the self-effulgent Purusha that is higher than the higher (Maya) .The

immanence and transcendentalism of the Supreme Being is described in Brhadaranyaka Third chapter, seventh section and in 3.9.26. and 4.4.16., Isavasya Upanishad, 1,8 From the Advaita point of view, immanence of Brahman in the universe is in the form of Existence which is the sub-stratum of names and forms. Transcendentalism of Brahman is in the form of being the sole reality, unrelated to the mithya names and forms of the universe. In the Saguna form, as Iswara, all pervasiveness is in the form of manifested nama roopa, immanence is in the form of being the Inner Controller (antaryami) in the universe and transcendentalism is in the form of the omniscient and omnipotent creator and ruler of the universe.

(e) The Nasadiyasukta (Rg. Veda 10 129) talks of the state before creation and the incomprehensibility of creation. –

“ There was neither non-existence nor existence (*na asat asit n sa tadanim*). There was neither air nor space. What is it that is covering and where? In whose protection? Was water there, unfathomable, deep? Death then existed not. Yet, nor was there life immortal. There was no knowledge of day and night.

That which was the One. (the non-dual) breathed without air, by its own nature. Apart from It there was nothing whatsoever. Darkness there was, at first concealed in darkness. All this was water unseen.

That which was covered by Void, that One stirred, by the might of Its tapas and came to be. Desire, the first sprout of mind, arose.

Sages who searched within their hearts discovered the connection of sat in asat. Their line (of vision) was extended across. What was above? What was below? There were begetters; there were mighty forces, the material universe (*swadha*) below, impulse above.

Who verily knows, who can declare whence it was born and whence comes this creation?

The gods are subsequent in the creation. (Even they cannot know); who knows then whence it first came into being?

He, the first origin of creation, whether he formed it or did not form it?

He who is presiding over it all indeed knows, or maybe He does not."

(To this, we can add Rg.Veda 10.81.6 - "Where was the place, which was the primeval material, and of what kind, from which Vishwakarma (the creator of the universe) created the world and disclosed the heavens, he who is totally eye?" Hiranyagarbhgha sukta cited earlier (Rg.veda 10.121). Yajurveda Vajaneyasamhita 32.8 – "The loving sage beholds that Mysterious Existence wherein the universe come to have one home; therein unites and therefrom issues the whole; the Lord is warp and woof of created beings" Agamarshana sukta – "This world was brought into being by that luminous god, the impeller of all action in accordance with the laws of creation and the law of life. Primordial matter lying in darkness began to evolve. By this evolution, the great expanse of matter began to gain momentum. From this movement came into existence space and time.....The sustainer of the world caused the sun and noon, the luminous bodies and the earth, the heavenly region ......as in the previous cycles of creation".)

(f) The Nasadiya sukta will bring to or mind Upanishad passages such as "Taittiriya 2.7.1 "In the beginning all this was the unmanifested (asat). From that emerged the manifested (sat). That Brahman created Itself by Itself." Taittiriya 2.6.1 –He (the atma) wished, 'Let me be many, let me be bon'. He undertook a deliberation (*sah tapah atapyata*) .Having deliberated, he created all that exists"; Kathopanishad 1.3.11 – "The Unmanifested is higher than Mahat; the Purusha is higher than the Unmanifested.". Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.3 – "That (Existence) visualised". Mundaka Upanishad 1.1.9 – "From Him who is omniscient in

general and all-knowing in detail and whose tapah consists in the exercise of His omniscience evolve Hiranyagarbha and this universe of nama roopa".

(g) From the point of view of Advaita Vedanta, one can see in this sukta the nucleus of the ideas of Paramatma, Iswara and Maya which we come across later in the Upanishads. "There was neither existence nor non-existence can be taken to refer to the paramarthika plane beyond the avyakta (Unmanifested) and vyakta (Manifest) conditions of Maya. (For Brahman, there is no universe). "By tapas (deliberation) He awoke and desire arose "can only refer to Iswara, .because Brahman is amanah (devoid of mind). The entity that covering what was there can refer to Maya. "He who is presiding over it all indeed knows" from whom this creation came into being …He verily knows" should refer to the omniscient Iswara. "Maybe He does not" can refer to Brahman, because Brahman-consciousness is not a knower-consciousness. When we look at the Rg.veda mantra 10.81.6, we are in the midst of the riddle, "Since space, time and matter are themselves are part of creation, where was the creator? When did he create? Out of what did he create?" and we have to take recourse to the Advaita Vedanta concept of unreal creation.

Section 73 - Sastra Is Basis For Any Inferential Proposition In Vedanta

1. Brahma caitanyam (the original consciousness) can never be objectified. – Vide Mundaka "adresyam, agrahyam……" .Taittiriya 2.4.1 - "Yatho vaco nivartante aprapyaa manasa saha" , Kena 5 "yat manasa na manute…." , Kena 3 – "Eyes do not reach That nor do words and not even the mind'. But we infer that we can recognize a changeless consciousness other than the mind in us, which expressesas a constant I in and through the changes of our body and mind we can infer from avasta traya vivieka etc. We also infer that there must be a consciousness in us from which the mind derives its knower-consciousness, because Sastra says that mind is matter, vide

Chandogya 6.5.4 and 6.6.2. That consciousness is the Brahma caitanyam we know only from Sastra. Apart from mahavakyas, we have Katopanishad 2.2.12, 13, Svetasvatara 2.14, , 3.7, 4.17, , Brahadaranyaka 4.,4.23, Taittiriya 2.2.1, Kaivalya 23, Mundaka Upanishad etc. E.g., Mundaka describes the transcendental, all pervading Brahman (called Purusha) in the first section of the second chapter and in 2.1.10, says that he who knows this immortal Brahman as existing in the heart destroys here the knot of ignorance. In the second Chapter also, having described Brahman in 2.2.4 and 2.2.5, in 2.2.7, it says, " That (that Brahman) which is omniscient and all-knowing which is of this kind is seated in the space within the luminous city of the heart."Ya sarvajnah sarvavid asya esha mahimaa bhuvi divye brahmapure hi esha vyomne atma pratishtitah" Having described the nature and glory of Brahman, the Upanishad says that paramatma is installed (i.e. available for recognition) in the heart of everyone. The heart is called the residence of Brahman, because in the heart only the mind is located and in the mind alone Brahman is manifest as the sakshi caitanyam. Really speaking, Brahman is not located in the heart, Brahman, as sastra tells us, is all pervading , vide Taittiriya 2.1 – "…anantam", Swesvatara 3.11, 3.21, Mundaka 1.1.6). The all pervading cannot be confined to any particular location. Brahman is everywhere, but only in the heart (i.e., in the mind within the hear) Brahman is manifest. The Upanishads says 'the heart is shining', because within the heart alone mind is there and in the mind there are thoughts and thoughts are like mirrors reflecting the sakshi caitanyam in the form of cidabhasa like pools of water reflecting the sun. The Upanishad calls Brahman 'manomaya h' because you cannot objectify the Brahma caitanyam (the sakshi); you can recognize it only through the cidabhasa., the reflection of the sakshi caitanyam in the thoughts arising in the mind.

(vide Sankaracarya's commentary – " ….the omniscient¸ the effulgent One of such glory , illuminated by all the states of the intellect, this being the place where Brahman is evermanifest in its nature of Consciousness; in the space that is within the heart,

Brahman is pereceived as though seated in that ……; for any going or coming or staying , in any other sense is impossible for one who is all-pervasive like space. He, the atma, as seated there is revealed variously through the mental states; and hence He is associated with the mind, being conditioned by it". (" Sa esha sarvajna mahimaa devah (divye_) dhyotanou iti sarvaboudhdha-pratyayakrta dhyotane, (brahmapure) brahmanah atra caitanyaswaroopena nitya abhivyaktvaat brahmanah puram hrdyapundariikam tasmin-aakase hrdpundariika-madhyasthe , ptratishtitah iva upalabhyate.. Na hi aakasavsat sarvagaytasya gatih aagatih pratishtou anyathaa sambhavati"). The same idea is reiterated in Mundaka 2.2.9 – "In the supreme bright sheath is Brahman, free from taints and without parts. It is pure and it is the light of lights." ("Hiranmaye pare kose nirajam brahma nishkalam; yat subhram jyotishaam jyotih-tat-aatmavidah-viduh"). Sankaracarya's commentary- "'In the supreme bright sheath'; it is called a sheath because of its being the place for the realization of the nature of the atma, just as a scabbard is in the case of a sword. It is supreme because It is the inmost of all and shining, being illumined with the intellectual perceptions.")

Thus, logic can carry us to the point where we can recognize a consciousness other than the mind. But that that consciousness is none other than the infinite all-pervading Brahman, we have to know only from Sastra.

2. By observing the regressive transformation of objects (e.g., pot being broken and becoming potsherd and potsherd decaying and becoming earth), we can infer that while attributes of objects change, the existence of an object in some form or other remains. But it is only from Sastra that we come to know that (a) existence is the essence and the reality, (b) that our experience of a world of objects is due only to the superimposition of nama roopa consisting of attributes on existence which is the sub-stratum (c) that that existence is all pervading, existing not only in objects but outside,

(d) that Existence is also Consciousness and (e) that that Existence- Consciousness, called Brahman is not different from our inner consciousness called atma.

3. Sastra says that Brahman is non-dual, eternal, changeless, devoid of instruments of cogitation and action. From this, we have to understand that (i) the world we experience cannot have the same status and (ii) Brahman cannot be the actual creator. As regards the status of the world, we rely on Sastra – vide Taittiriya 2.6, which indicates three orders of reality, Brhadaranyaka 4.3.31,2.4.14,45.15, which qualifies the existence of things other than Brahman with the words,' "as it were", Brahadaranyaka 2.3.6, which calls Brahman as the Truth of truth, the praana (which stands for the universe) etc. As regards the actual creator, in the form of Iswara associated with Maya, again, we have to rely on certain statements in the Upanishads, such as Swetasvatara 4.9, 4.10 etc.
4. We experience a universe of objects that exist. By our intellect, we cannot know that it consists of. the sub-stratum of existence which is none other than Brahman and names and forms (nama roopa) superimposed on that sub-stratum and what are created and resolve later are only the superimposed nama roopa consisting of various attributes like shape, color, smell, emotions, thoughts etc. We know this only from Sastra, such as Kathopanishad 1.2.1, 2.2.8, 2.31, Brhadaranyaka 2.5.15, Mundaka 2.2.2, Chandogya 8.14.1, Taittiriya 3.10.3, ,Swetasvatara 1.8, Brhadaranyaka 1.4.7, Chandogya 6.1.4,5,6,6.3.2,, 8.4.1 etc.
5. Upanishad says in mahavakyams etc. that our real nature is the infinite Brahman. But we identify with our body mind complex and regard ourselves as limited individuals. That is to say, we are ignorant of our real nature as Brahman. What is the ignorance due to? That we can know only from Sastra, such as Kaivalya Upanishad 12 and Krishna Upanishad 12. `Kaivalya 12, 13 – " The jivatma deluded by Maya identifies with the body and does all actions (which stands for all perceptions, feelings and thoughts) undergoes experiences in the waking state", :"The jiva experiences pleasure

and pain, by his own *maaya* (i.e., mistaking the false to be true), in the dream world conjured by himself. The power of Maya to create ignorance of their Brahmatvam in jivas (avarana sakti) is indicated in Swetasvatara Upanishad 1.3 and 1.4.

6. Sastra declares that one who knows himself as Brahman attains Brahman. But we see bodies dying, while people are still in a state of ignorance. We also know that we have a mind, apart from the body. So, we have to conclude that the mind (sukhma sarira) continues after death and will have rebirths until it gets the knowledge of identity with Brahman. (cf. Katopanishad 2.2.7).
7. We observe, in life that there is suffering and enjoyment for people unrelated to their present actions, virtues and vices. Attributeless Brahman cannot be responsible for this divergence. Nor can you attribute motive to Maya which is inert matter, vide Swetasvatara 4.10 which uses the term 'prakriti'. (The word prakriti, borrowed from Sankhya philosophy refers to the material cause the universe.) That leaves Iswara. That it is not Iswara who is responsible for the unequal experiences of jivas and that our enjoyment and suffering are the result of our own actions and thoughts in our past lives we have to learn from Sastra. Vide Brahadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.6 – The man who has desires transmigrates , together with his karma, enjoys the results (in the other world) and he returns from that world to this world for (fresh) work."; Prasna Upanishad – Udana (a sub-division of prana that carries the jiva in its travel after death) leads the jiva to a virtuous world as a result of (his) virtue and to sinful world as a result of (his) sin and to the human world as a result of both (*punyena punyam lokam paapena paapam ubhayam eva manushyalokam).* Having talked of the blissful state of sushupti., Kaivalya Upanishad 14 says tat, due to the karma of past janmas, the jiva comes back to the swapna and jagrat avasthas from the blissful state of sushupti (to undergo suffering and enjoyment).
8. We know that we have a knower-consciousness in the form of ahamkara. That this ahamkara is the inert mind made sentient by its closeness to Brahma caitanyam (in the

sense of its being subtle) we know only from Sastra, such as Taittiriya 3.71 – "Because if the space-like, all pervading Brahman was not there, who could inhale and exhale?.......This one, this supreme atma which resides in the heart blesses everyone with consciousness and happiness"; Swetasvatara 6.11 – "Hidden in all beings is the non-dual Effulgent One. It is all pervading.........It resides in all jivas; it is the sakshi; it is what makes (the mind) conscious (c*etayita*). Kenopanishad 1.2 talks of atma as the mind of the mind. Mundaka Upanishad 2.2.10 and Kathopanishad 2.2.15, having described the original consciousness in a poetic language, say, "It alone is the light.... It is by Its light all else shines". Kathopanishad 2.2.9 and 10 talk of the atma inside all beings assuming separate shapes in accordance with different forms, like fire assuming the form of each log of wood and air assuming the shape of the objects in which it is enclosed. Brahadaranyaka 2.5.18 says Brahman entered the bodies as a bird (the word 'bird' is interpreted as the sukshma sarira.) In 2.5.19, it is said that Brahman transformed Himself in accordance with each form; and that form of His is for making Him known (*roopam roopam pratiroopo behoove, tadasya roopam praticakhanaaya*). Chandogya Upanishad 7.3.2 talks of Brahman entering into the three gods in the form of the jivatma of each individual being.

9. Having been taught that the transmigration of jiva is due to the punya papa of jivas and punya papa is the result of the actins and thoughts of jivas, the question arises, "What about the first janma. What is it due to? If there is no jiva doing action and engaging in thoughts, there is no punya papa. If there is no punya papa jiva would not be born. Since this vicious circle leads to infinite regress, we have to say that the cycle of jivas, their actions and thought, punya papa and rebirth is without a beginning (it is anaadi). Similarly, Iswara, the creator has to exist somewhere but space itself is a nama roopa created by Iswara through Maya. This is, again is a vicious circle. Therefore, here also, we have to say that Iswara and Maya are anaadi. Swetasvatara Upanishad 1.9 says, in effect, "Jiva, Iswara and Maya are anaadi."

10. We suffer in samsara because of our identification with the body-mind complex and taking the world of nama roopa to be real. Sastra says that the means of liberation from samsara is negation of the sense of reality of the world that we perceive and knowledge of identity with Brahman (brahmasatyam jaganmithya). If our being body-mind complex and the world of nama roopa were real, we cannot be free of these by mere knowledge. Therefore it is logical to say that they are unreal. As cited in the main text and also earlier here, there are numerous texts to show that the world of nama roopa is unreal.
11. That the means of liberation is knowledge of our identity with Brahman, we know only from Sastra. Upanishad passages to this effect have been cited in the main text.
12. That liberation is possible in this very life we know only from Sastra. Upanishad passages to this effect have been cited in the main text.
13. That there is a Brahman which is of the nature of Existence-Consciousness-Infinity and It is without any attributes, that itself we know only from Sastra. Upanishad passages conveying this idea have been cited in the main text.
14. There are two corollaries in respect of the means prescribed by Sastra for liberation from samsara, namely, disidentification from the body-mind complex and identification with Brahman – (i) He becomes free of the sancita karma pertaining to that body-mind complex which he has disowned. (ii) By virtue of identification with Brahman, he is no longer to be regarded as a karta or bhokta. Passage to this effect we get in Mundaka Upanishad 2. 2.8. But to know that prarabdha that remains after its exhaustion until the rise of knowledge continues we know only from Sastra, vide Chandogya Upanishad 6.14.2.
15. That when a jivanmukta dies (what is called videhamukti takes place), the sthoola, sukshma and karana sariras disintegrate (dissolves in the cosmos) and the caitanyam that is his real nature is merged in Brahma caitanyam, we know only from Sastra. Upanishad passages to this effect have been cited in the main text.

16. The question is often asked, “If the world is unreal, why does Sastra teach creation? The answer is that on the principle that you have to go the known from the unknown, and since a beginner is coming after experiencing a concrete world, Sastra goes along with him and talks of the creation and evolution of the world and later, when he advances in the learning, negates the nama roopa, as in “There is no diversity whatsoever in It”, “Not this, not this”) and teaches brahma satyam jaganmithya. This method is called *adhaaropa apavaada*. It is because ultimately, the whole world is to be dismissed as mithya that we find variations in the details of creation in various Upanishads. (For example, the order of creation in Taittiriya is space, air, fire, water, earth, vegetation, food, man. In Chandogya, the order is fire, water, from water food, from food body and mind .In Aitereya, creation is simultaneous.)

Section 74 - Recapitulation of the important points in the teaching

Brahman is the only reality. The nature of Brahman is Existence-Consciousness-Infinity (satyam jnanam anantam).

For Brahman, there is no universe. But we, living beings (jivatmas) experience a universe. The universe is unreal. In the universe, itself, there are certain things which we regard as real when we experience it but which turn out to be false later. To accommodate this phenomenon, Advaita Vedanta postulates three orders of reality, (a) the absolute (paramarthika), in which category Brahman alone is, (b) the empirical (vyavaharika) in which category the perceived part of the world experienced by us in the waking state falls and (c) illusory (pratibhasika) in which the world that we experience during the dream state falls, as also erroneous perceptions like a snake being seen on a rope, space being seen as blue etc. The universe that we experience is a mixture of existence belonging to Brahman and nama roopa (attributes like shape, color etc. of things and the characteristics

of our body and mind). The sub-stratum is real and unchanging. The nama roopa which are superimposed on it is unreal and changing. Not only do individual nama roopa undergo change, but the whole set of nama roopa changes in a cycle of differentiation (srishti) and resolution into a seed form (laya). The one who is responsible for this srishti and laya is an entity called Iswara, constituted of an unreal power, called Maya, located in Brahman, in which the conscious aspect of Brahman (Brahma caitanyam) is reflected. With the conscious aspect, Iswara visualizes creation and with the matter aspect, which is Maya, the nama roopa which are in seed form are unfolded by Maya through its vikshepa sakti, under His guidance. We jivas are a mixture of the indivisible Brahma caitanyam, available for recognition as consciousness behind our mind (called atma or sakshi caitanyam), the subtle body (sukshma sarira including the mind) in which Brahma caitanyam is reflected and the physical body. Our real nature is Brahma caitanyam. The rest of us is unreal. But, owing to the veiling power (avarana sakti) of Maya, we are ignorant of our real nature as brahma caitanyam and identifying ourselves with our body and mind, regard ourselves as limited individuals. Atma is devoid of instruments of knowledge and action; It is neither a doer (karta) nor an enjoyer (bhokta) but though we are really the atma, we have the false notion that we are the doers and enjoyers and with the aid of ahamkara (the mind aided by the reflection of brahma caitanyam, called cidabhasa) interact with objects of the world and other jivatmas. In the process, we undergo suffering and enjoyment. The suffering and enjoyment among the jivatmas is unequal and not related to current actions and thoughts. This is due to the law of karma, according to which for whatever actions we do or thoughts we entertain we have to pay a price in the form of suffering and enjoyment in future janmas. Iswara is the administrator of the law of karma (karmaphaladata), designs each creation and each janma of a jivatma, correlating the part of accumulated (sancita) which has fructified (prarabdha) and the objects, surroundings and situations of the universe as well as the physical and mental equipment of the jivatmas. But jivatmas have a free will also. The means of liberation from the cycle of action and thoughts, rebirths and enjoyment

and suffering (called samsara) is knowledge of identity with Brahma caitanyam (jiva-brahma-aikya jnanam). To gain this knowledge and assimilate it, we have to study sastra (the core of it is the Upanishads) under the guidance of a teacher (guru) who has come in the lineage of the teacher-student succession (gurusishya parampara) and who has himself gained and assimilated jiva-brahma-aikya-jnanam (srotriya brahmanishta). The preparatory spiritual practice to gain what is called sadahana catushtaya samaptti (sadhana) consists of karma yoga and upasana. The sadhana catushtaya samaptti consists of discrimination of the permanent and the ephemeral (atma anatma viveka), dispassion towards material ends (vairagya), purity of mind (citta suddhi), mental concentration (samaadhaana) faith in sastra and guru (sraddha) and earnest desire to gain jivabrahma-aikya-jnanam (mumuksutvam). Thereafter we have to study sastra under a guru who is srotriya brahmanishta. Listen to the teacher expounding the sastra is called sravanam. Getting doubts cleared by reflection and discussion with the guru is called mananam. Emptying the mind of the notions and attitudes born out of the identification with the body mind in janma after janmas by dwelling on the teaching of sastra to accomplish total, unreserved mental identification with Brahma caitanyam is called nididhyasana. If this course of sravanam, mananam and nididhyasanam is gone through successfully, we get liberated from samsara (we will get moksha). Moksha is only discovering what was hidden from us, i.e., our real nature as the infinite Brahman. The benefit is unalloyed peace and happiness. It is possible to get moksha in the very life in which we gain jiva-brahma-aikya jnanam. A person who has gained jiva-brahm-aikya jnanam is called a jivanmukta. For a jivanmukta, death is dissolution of all the three bodies (the sthoola, sukshma and karana) .The atma caitanyam of the jivanmukta gets 'merged' in the brahma caitanyam. The cycle of srshti, sthithi, laya, the jivatmas, karma, Iswara and Maya area beginningless (anaadi).

(The method of teaching followed in the Upanishads is called *adhyaropa apavaada)*. Since none of the criteria of definition is applicable for the purpose of revealing Existence-

Consciousness-Infinity, Upanishads take recourse to *tataastha lakshanam*. It presents the experienced universe (adhyaropa) and the cause (karanam) is said to be Existence-Consciousness (sat-*cit)*. Later, the effect (karyam) is shown to be mithya (as in 'neti neti', 'na bhoomirapo….'etc.) (apavada) and what was previously called karanam is declared to be the adhishtanam (the sub-stratum) of the adhyasta jagat (the superimposed universe) – vide Chandogya 6.8.6 – "Sarva prajaa sat-aaayatanaah sat-pratishthaa", Chandogya 6.41 – vacaarambhanam vikaro namadheyam).

Section 75 - Meaning Of Saantipaatha Of Sukla –Yajur-Veda

1. The first sentences of saanti paathas of the four Vedas is as follows:-
   - Rg.veda – Om vangme manasi pratishtitaa
   - Sukla Yajurveda - Om poornamadah poornamidam poornaat poornamudacyate
   - Krishna Yajurveda – Om sahnaavavatu sahanou bhunaktu
   - Samaveda – Om aapyaayantu mamaangaani vak praanacakshuh srotram atho balam indriyaani ca sarvaani
   - Atharvaveda – Om bhadhram karnebhih srunuyaama devaah bhadram pasyemaakshabhiryajatraah
2. The full text of the Sukla Yajurveda ssantipaatha is "Poornam adah poornam idam. Poornaat poornam udacyate. Poornasya poornam aadaaya poornam eva avasishyate. Om saantih saantih saantih."
3. If one goes by the literal meaning (vacyartha), the saantipaatha will read as follows:-

That is whole. This is whole. From that whole this whole is born. When this whole is taken away from that whole, that whole remains."

This would look like a riddle. So we look for the implied meaning (lakshyartha). The lakshyartha is discussed below.

The first sentence is ‘poornamadah poornamidam’.

Adah = That Paramatma

Poornah = (is) limitless

Idam = This jivatma

Poornam = (is) limitless.

Thus we have, “That Paramatma is limitless; this jivatma is limitless”. We know that the limitless, the infinite, can be only one; infinity and existence of two entities are contradictory. Since there can be only one poornam, infinity, we conclude that paramatma and jivatma are one and the same. Thus we arrive at jivatma paramatma aikyam. Sopadhika paramatma, who is sarvajna, sarveswara, sarvavyapi and sopadhika jivatma whom is alpajna alpasaktiman and alpavyaapi (possessing limited knowledge, limited powers and limited spatial existence) cannot be identical. So, when we talk of identity (aikyam), we are talking of the identity of nirupadhika jivatma and nirupadhika jivatma.

Literal meaning of the sentence ‘poornaat poornam udacyate’ would be ‘from poorna paramatma poorna jivatma is born’. This will contradict the previous conclusion that jivatma and paramatma are identical, because karana karya sambandha (cause effect relationship) is always between two entities. So, we have to conclude that the meaning of the sentence is that from sopadhika paramatma sopadhika jivatma is born, i.e., jivas are created by Iswara.

The next sentence is 'Poornasya poornam aadaaya poornam eva avasishyate'. Poornasya = from sopadhika atma

Poornam = poorna atma

Aadaaya = is separated

Poornam eva avasishyate = poorna atma alone remains.

Thus we have 'from sopadhika atma, poorna atma is taken away, poorna atma alone remains'.

From Atma + upadhi, if we take away atma, what should remain ? Upadhi. But the Upanishad says that atma alone remains. That means when atma is not there, there is no upadhi. The idea is that upadhi cannot exist independently of atma. What has no independent existence is mithya. So, we understand that anatma is mithya. The nama roopa including our body-mind complex is mithya.

The final meaning of the santipatha is "Nirupadjhika paramatma and nirupadjhika jivatma are identical. From sopadhika paramatma sopadhika jivatma is born. Upadhi is mithya. Nirupadhika atma alone is satyam.

Thus, this santipatha is the essence of the entire Uppanishad – 'brahmasatyam jaganmithya'.

Section 76 - Meaning Of "Uttama Purusha"

From Chandogya Upanishad 8.12.3, we know that the term, "*uttama purusha*" in sastra refers to nirguna Brahman, not saguna Brahman. This is relevant, because Visishtadvaitins talk of purushottama as an appellation of the personal God, Lord Vishnu.

Section 77 - Departure Of Presiding Deities Of Indriyas When A Person Dies

When a person dies, the presiding deities of the indriyas withdraw from the sense organs. So, when he travels to the next world, after death, the sense organs are non-functional. So, until he takes rebirth in one of the worlds and the presiding deities return to the sense organs there is no memory or enjoyment. The punya papa of the karma and upasana done and vasanas acquired in that life are carried by this non-functioning sukshma sarira. - vide Brahadaranyaka 4.4.1 and 2.

Section 78 - Step By Step Teaching Of Upahita Caitanyam

In Brhadaranyaka , from 3.7.2 to 3.8.11, the Upanishad leads us from the subtle principle of the universe (Hiranyagarbha, called s*ootra),* from sootra to the causal principle *(* Iswara, called *antaryami* and *aakasa*) – up to this, the vyaharika prapanca - and from akasa to the absolute , Brahman, called *aksharam* (the Immutable) – i.e., from the *samashti sukshma prapannca upahita caitanyam* to *samashti kaarana prapanca upahita caitanyam and from the samashti karana prapanca upahita caitanyam* to *nirupaadhika caitanyam*. (This is to teach us that the ultimate essence is nirguna Brahman, not any form of saguna Brahman). In 3.7.23, dealing with the Inner Controller, Iswara and 3.8.11, dealing with nirguna Brahman as" it is never the known, but is the Knower; there is no other Knower than He/It", the description in the same terms indicates that Iswara, in His real nature is Brahman. There is only one Brahman on which the notions of jiva and Iswara are superimposed. In his commentaty on 3.8.12, which concludes the topic, Sankaracarya says, "What is the difference between them, the Immutable (*aksharam*) and the Internal Ruler (*antaryaami*)?.Intrinsically there is neither difference nor idenitity among them, for they are by nature pure Consciousness……The unconditioned Self (*nirupaadhika atma*),

being beyond speech and mind, devoid of attributes and one, is designated as 'not this, not this'; when it has the limiting adjuncts (*upadhi*s) of the body and organs, which are characterized by *avidya*, desire and work, It is called the *samsari jiva* and when the atma has the limiting adjunct of the power of eternal and unsurpassable knowledge (i.e. Maya), It is called the Internal Ruler, Iswara. The same atma, nirupadhika , absolute and pure, by nature, is called the Immutable, the Supreme. (aksharam, *para*). Similarly, having the limiting adjuncts of the bodies and organs of Hiranyagarbha, the Undifferentiated, the gods, the species, the individual, man, animal, spirits etc., the atma assumes the particular names and forms. Thus we have explained through the Sruti vakyam 'It moves and does not move' (Isavasya 5). In this light alone, such texts as 'This is your atma (within all) (Brhadaranyaka 3.4.1,2 and 3.5.1), "He is the inner self of all beings" (Mundaka 2.1.4), "This (Brahman) is hidden in all beings'"(Katho 1.3.12), "Thou art That" (Chandogya 5.8.7), 'I myself am all this' (Chandogya 7.25.1), 'All this but the atma'(Chandogya7.25.1) and 'There is no other witness but He' (Brhadaranyaka 3.7.23) will not become contradictory; in any other view they cannot be harmonised. Therefore the entities mentioned above differ only because of their limiting adjuncts, but not in any other manner, for all the Upanishads conclude "One only without a second" (Chandogya 6.2.1).

By saying "Vacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam", Chandogya establishes that *kaaryam* (effect) is mithya and *kaaranam* (cause) alone is satyam. In the universe, every karanam itself is a karyam of something. By saying "idam agra aasiit ekam eva advidiiyam", the Upanishad establishes that Brahman, the ultimate cause (Taittiriya 2.6, Chandogya 6.2.3) not being a karyam, is satyam. The first stage of teaching is that I is different from *anitya anatma*. (Waves which have location are different from the locationless water.) But we have to avoid *dwaitam*. So the final stage of teaching is that there is no anatma other than atma. (There is no wave other than water; what appears as wave is water only.) Infinite existence-consciousness alone is the reality; anatma has no existence of its own. If gold is

withdrawn there will be no ornament. Without Brahman, there will be no world for jivas. (*sa ya esho anima etat aatmyam idam sarvam tat satyam sa atma tattvamasi swetaketo* – Chandogya 6.8.7). The purpose of introducing srshti and later negating it (by the adhyaropa apavada method) is to teach *Brahma satyam jaganmithya*. But whenever creation, sustenance and dissolution are talked about, "Brahman is cause" means that as Existence, Brahman provides the sub-stratum and as Consciousness, in Its presence, cidabhasa is formed in Maya, enabling Iswara to do creation etc. Failing to reach Brahman, words along with the mind turn back (yato vaco nivartante; apraapya mnasaa saha (Chandogya 2.4.) .Therefore the upanishasd takes recourse to this devious route.

Section 79 - Claimant Of "Aham Brahmasmi"

Pramaata cannot claim to be Brahman. *Saakshi* cannot say, "I am Brahman" either, because sakshi is devoid of the instruments of speech and mind. It is the mixture of sakshi and pramata (with *cidabhasa*) that says," I am Brahman" but the "I" in that statement refers to sakshi alone.

Section 80 - Significance Of Negation Of Kosas In Pancakosa Viveka

While studying the *pancakosa v*iveka in Taittiriya Upanishad, we can appreciate the significance of the successive stages of negation of the *kosa*s. When sruti says that annamaya is atma it enables us to get rid of identification with wife, children etc.; my body is different from yours. (Incidentaly, in karma kanda, one of the exceptions to the rule that one who does karma enjoys karmaphalam is the provision that if the father is ill, the son can do sandhyavandanam etc. on the father's behalf, as a proxy; son does the karma and the phalam goes to the father.) Example for absence of disidentification with the family is the sanyasi. When annamaya is negated and manomaya and vijnamaya are said to be atma,

we get rid of the fear of death and we can appreciate that if the physical body itself is atma, when it dies there will be unexhausted karma and there will be I (the fallacies of someone else undergoing karmaphalam or karma going without karmaphalam.) When pranamaya is negated, we can appreciate the statements of people around when some one dies that prana has gone. When manmomaya and vijanamya are negated, we can appreciate that they are instruments that we use and what we use as instrument cannot be ourselves. When anandamaya is negated we can appreciate that the samsara that we are free from during sushupti does not belong to atma and the happiness that we recollect is not *swaroopa ananda* but its reflection registered in the *kaarana sariram*.

Section 81 - Illumination By Sakshi

Sakshi illumines the mind means is that cidabhasa is formed in the mind and the mind is able to illumine the external world and to know its own thoughts.

Section 82 - Happiness Is Reflected Anandaswaroopam Of Brahman

Temporary happiness of ajnanis on achieving a desired object before another desire arises is the ananda swaroopam of Brahman reflected in cidabhasa. Objects are not the source of ananda (*Vishaye ananda naasti*.) If objects give ananda, the same object must give to all and to any particular person all the time. What is sweet to one man is another man's poison. Pudding is sweet to me when I start but after the fifth or sixth helping I develop aversion. Objects only provide the occasion for the ananda swaroopam of Brahman to be reflected in the calm mind. The constant happiness of the jnani who has the knowledge that he is Brahman is the reflection of the infinitude of Brahman. (*Pibhare ramarasam. Raso vai rasah*). Tasting *brahmarasam* is owning up the fact that *poornatvam* is my permanent nature. The consequent sense of utter fulfillment is called *brahmarasa-anubhava*.

Section 83 - Mutual Superimposition Of Atma And Anatma

A Purvapakshi raises objections to mutual superimposition of atma and anatma.

1. Can anatma be superimposed on atma? Superimposition requires the following conditions:-

   (a) The general characteristic of the sub-stratum should be known and special characteristics should be unknown

   (b) The sub-stratum should not be clearly perceived

   (c) There should be similarity between the sub-stratum and the superimposed entity.

   Atma, being nirguna, does not have any general or special characteristics. Atma is always self-effulgent. Atma has no similarity with the anatma. Therefore atma cannot be the sub-stratum for any superimposition.
2. Can atma be superimposed on anatma? The sub-stratum of superimposition has to be a real entity. If the sub-stratum as well as the entity superimposed are mithya, it will result in *sunyavada*. Since anatma is mithya, it cannot be the sub-stratum of superimposition . If it is claimed that anatma is real, it can never be sublated and there will be no possibility of liberation.
3. Only when it is established that anatma is superimposed on atma can atma be said to have some concealed characteristic and similarity with anatma. Only after it is established that the atma has some concealed characteristic and similarity with anatma can it be said that anatma is superimposed on atma. Thus there is the fallacy of mutual dependence.
4. If it is argued that mutual superimposition is possible, because it is due to avidya, it cannot be of any help, because avidya itself is not logically possible in atma which is self-effulgent. Avidya can be mithya only if it is superimposed on atma by itself but this will have the defect of mutual dependence. If another avidya superimposes this avidya,

there will be the fallacy of infinite regress. If the superimposed is real, there can be no liberation.

5. If everything is due to superimposition, there can be no distinction between illusion and right knowledge. To say that the same atma is the means of knowledge, the object of knowledge, the knowledge itself and the knower is contradictory. If it is claimed that there is no contradiction, then it becomes *vijnaanavaada* in which everything is nothing but internal cognition.

Refutation by the Advaita Vedantin is as follows:-

It is well known that everyone has knowledge in the form, "I am a man, I am a karta and a bhokta". This is not a mere remembrance; it is a direct experience. It is devoid of the cognition of difference between himself and his body. It is not right knowledge. Sruti statements such as Brhadaranyaka 4.3.7, 2.5.19, 3.9.28, 3.4.1, 3.5.1, 4.3.15, Taittiriya 2.1.1. and Chandogya 8.7.1 declare that atma is not a karta or bhokta and is none other than Brahman which is of the nature of supreme bliss. So, when a man says "I am a man; I am a karta and a bhokta", it is not right knowledge. Logic also leads to the same conclusion. Things which undergo change (such as the body and the mind) have necessarily to be limited in time, space and with respect to other objects and, therefore, they cannot be the all pervading, eternal, non-dual atma. Consciousness (swaroopa jnanam) is an undifferentiated changeless entity. It is different from the objectifying knowledge (vritti jnanam) such as 'knowledge of pot', 'knowledge of cloth' etc.(obtained either through the reflection of consciousness or conditioning of consciousness in the antahkarana). The notion of origination and destruction of knowledge is only due to the necessity of relating the knowledge to the object of knowledge, since we have to say which particular object knowledge is about. If swaroopa jnanam is split up and considered to be many, then space, time and directions will also be considered to be many. Moreover, if kartrtvam etc are real, then, there can be no liberation at all, because what is the real nature of a thing can never

be removed from it. If atma is not self-effulgent, the whole universe will be insentient. Being the object of supreme love of all, atma is of the nature of bliss. Therefore, atma is devoid of qualities, eternal, self-effulgent and of the nature of bliss.

Therefore, there is no escape from the conclusion that the cognition, "I am a man' etc. is only a delusion. And it is necessary to postulate a proper cause for the delusion. The cause has to be something which has the capacity not only to conceal the atma from the vision of the jiva but also to make the jiva who, in reality is the atma, identify himself with the body and the mind and regard himself as a karta and a bhokta. That cause is the indeterminable avidya which is superimposed on the non-dual atma. Atma cannot be the cause of the delusion because it is immutable. Mind, etc, cannot be the cause of the delusion because they are themselves the products of avidya. Avidya is revealed in Sruti statements such as – "(They realized) the power of the Supreme Being which is concealed by its own gunas" (Svesvatara 1.3), "Know Maya to be Prakriti and the wielder of Maya to be the supreme Lord" (Svesvatara 4.10), "The supreme Being is perceived as having manifold forms because of Maya" ((Brahadaranyaka 2.5.19), "They are covered by the untrue" (Chandogya 8.3.2), "Covered by mist" (Taittiriya Samhita 4.6.2.2), and "(By identification with Iswara one) finally becomes free from Maya which is in the form of the form of the universe" (Svesvatara 1.10). The fallacy of self-dependence on the ground that avidya is the cause of its own superimposition is ruled out because avidya is beginningless.

Section 84 - Vritti Vyapti And Phala Vyapti

Upanishad says that atma is swaprakasa (self-evident). It also says that atma is to be known by the mind (cetasaa veditvyam). How do we reconcile this? It means that what is required for atma to be revealed is removal of ignorance, the false notion, "I am the changing body-mind complex". When this notion is removed, what remains as the constant 'I' is the consciousness, This is not known as an object but is invoked as the very subject. In

technical language, for knowing anatma, *vritti vyaapti* and *phala vyaapti* are required but for recognizing atma, vritti vyapti (to remove the ignorance) is required but phala vyapti (to illumine the atma) is not required.

Example. In a dark room, there are two things – a flame and a stone. Each is covered by a pot. One of your hands is engaged otherwise. In the other hand, you are carrying a torch with a long handle. With that handle you knock off the pots that are covering the objects. Knocking of the pots is like vritti vyapti. To see the stone, you have to direct the torch light at the stone, because it does not shine of its own accord. Directing the torchlight is ike phala vyapti. But to see the flame, you don't have to direct the torchlight at it; it is self-shining (self-evident).

Section 85 - Emergence And Dissolution Of Cidabhasa

In Anubhuti Prakasa, elaborating Brhadaranyaka Upanishad mantra 2.4.12, and following Sankaracarya's commentary, Vidyarayanya discusses the emergence and dissolution of cidabhasa based on the example of the ocean and the lumps of salt given in the Upanishad. First, he disposes of a possible objection. Upanishad itself says that Brahman is *karya-karana-vilakshanah*; Brahman has not come out of anything and nothing has come out of Brahman; then, how can we say that jivatma has come out of Brahman? The answer is that it is a phenomenon created by Maya. In the paramarthika plane, there is neither arrival nor departure of the world. In the vyavaharika plane, there is arrival and departure of the world. Thereafter he discusses which aspects of the ocean-salt lumps example should be compared to what. Paramatma is compared to the ocean. Jivatmas are compared to the lumps of salt. Lumps of salt do not appear in the ocean as such. For lumps of salt to be produced salt pans are required. The sthoola sukshma sariras are compared to the salt pans. The heat of the sun is required for evaporation of the water; Avidya and the consequent adhyasa are compared to the sun and its heat. Pure atma cannot be a knower

because atma is nirvikara and knowing is modification of the mind. Anatma cannot be a knower because antma is inert (*jadam*). Maya produces a third entity which borrows consciousness (*cetanatvam*) from the atma and *savikaratvam* (modifying capacity) from anatma. This savikara cetana entity is cidabhasa, the reflected consciousness in the antahkarana. This combination of antahkarana and cidabhasa does karma and undergoes karmaphalam. *Kartrutvam* (sense being a doer) presupposes free will. Only if jiva is responsible for his action he can be required to undergo karmaphalam. Once cidabhasa is formed, localization and finitude happen to jivas. Neither localization nor finitude is real but jiva has the adhyasa of localization and finitude. Only by study of sastra under a guru, particularly analysis of mahavakyas, do jivas discover their identity with Brahman and the adhyasa of localization and finitude is removed. The juxtaposition of tat-padartha with tvam-padartha removes localization and finitude (*pariccinnatvam*) of jivatma and the justaposition of tvam-padartha with tat-padartha removed\s the remoteness (*parokshatvam*) of paramatma and the identity of the real nature of jivatma, the consciousness with paramatma is recognised. This is the state of jivanmukti. When the lumps of salt ate dissolved in the ocean they merge in it indistinguishably. Like that, at the time of videhamukti, the sthoola, suskhma and karana sariras along with the cidabhasa in them dissolve and the jivan muktas 'merge in Brahman' indistinguishably.

Formation of lumps of salt are events in time. But jivatmas are *anaadi* (beginning-less). The example should not be extended to the aspect of an event in time.

Section 86 - Antahkarana And Cidakasa In Producing Knowledge

According to Sastra, perception of outside objects happens by antahkarana ,along with cidaabhaasa, going out and pervading the object and assuming the shape of that object, like light emanating from a lamp contacting an object and assuming the shape of that object.

In respect of any object, there are two things - an externally existing object and a mental object of that object. What you experience (*bhogya-vastu*) is not the external object (*Iiswara-srshti*) but the internal image (*jiva-srshti*). The mental image of the same external object, say a woman, is coloured in the minds of different people in different ways, according to their tastes and values, their likes and dislikes (*raaga dwesha*) etc, which constitute a complex pattern due to *prarabdha* (the quota of karmaphalam allotted for exhaustion in a particular span of life (*janma*) out of the accumulated punya papa ((*sancita karma*), *vaasanas* (imprints of tastes, attitudes tendencies and wisdom in the mind on account of the experience in previous janmas), and training, knowledge undergone and wisdom gained in the current janma.

The external object (*bhoutika vastu*) is illumined by pramata. (*pramtru-bhaasyam*). From pramaata, a mode of thought surchaged by cidaabhaasa (*saabhaasa vritti*) goes out, like a ray of light, through sense organs (*karanam*). The vritti envelops the object, assumes the shape of the object and removes ignorance. This is called *vritti vyaapti*. Vritti is a mode of the mimd; it is a modification (*vikaara*). When the vritti vikara takes place, the pramaata, as the antahkarana surcharged with cidaabhasa, also undergoes modification. Vritti by itself is inert (*jada*). So, we cannot say that vritti illumines the object. The cidabhaasa in the vritti envelops the object simultaneously and illumines the object. The pervasion and illumination of the object uncovered by vritti vyaapti is called *phala vyaapti*. Thus knowledge of the object is produced. We said, earlier that the experience of the object is not an external phenomenon; it is an internal phenomenon; the experience is in the form of the image formed in the mind by vritti vyaapti and phala vyaapti. What about the vritti involved in this image? Vritti is jada, not self-illuminating (not *swayam-prakaasa)*. (The word, 'illumination' stands for the functioning of consciousness.) We cannot say that vritti is illumined by another vritti. That would lead to infinite regress (*anavastha dosha*). The Brahma caitanyam present in jiva (*saakshi*) illumines the vritti involved in the internal

image. How does sakshi illumine? By the very formation of reflected consciousness (cidabhasa) in that vritti. The very pervasion of the vritti in the internal image by the cidabhasa is called illumination by saakshi (*saakshi-bhaasyam*). So, also, in the same sense, any vritti involved in a thought in the mind, without the current presence of an external object, like recalling a thing or incident, or speculation or theorisising, is also said to be saakshi-bhaasyam.

Example. Sun is up above. Mirror is on the ground placed in an appropriate angle. Sunlight falls on the mirror. The sunlight reflected from the mirror illumines the dark room. We don't say that mirror illumines the room. We say that the sunlight illumines the room. Sun is responsible for the sunlight; therefore we also say that sun illumines the mirror.

Section 87 - What Happens In Videha Mukti

The Jivanmukta merges into Iswara during videhamukti from the vyaavahaarika point of view.

From Paaaramaarthika point of view there is no actual merging, though it is said that jivanmukta merges in Brahman. Jiva is ever Brahman. So, there is no event of merging in Brahman at the time of videha mukti. The only event that takes place is the dissolution of the individual bodies (*sukshma and karana sariras*). This is the merging in Iswara. From paramarthika angle, there is no question of merging in Brahman. Jiva is ever Brahman. When the word 'merging' is used, we can only talk of merging in Iswara. From the paramarthika angle one is Brahman in videha mukti as well as earlier, earlier than even the jivanmukti stage, when the event of removal of ajnanam takes place. From the vyavaharika angle, sukshma sarira and karana sarira of videhamukta get dissolved in the cosmic sarirams; this is the merging in Iswara.

Section 88 - Spontaneous Invocation Of Identity With Brahman By The Jivanmukta

In the course of jnana yoga, in the beginning, when provocative situations arise, one has to deliberately recollect "aham brahaasmi", I am not the body or the mind. But later, the aham brahmasmi attitude becomes spontaneous. Not that when engaged in any secular activity, the jnaani has to go on thinking "I am Brahman". Because his mind has to be engaged in that activity and no two thoughts can co-exist. Bu, when a situation arises in which an ajnani would react, identified with his body or his mind, feeling sorrow, anger, etc., in the casre of a jnaani, his firm knowledge "I am atma" comes into play spontaneously and governs his reaction. His thought will be "This is not happening to me, the atma. Why should I worry?", "This cannot affect me, the atma".

Section 89 - Animals Do Not Acquire Agami Karma

Animals have no free will. So, they do not acquire *agami karma*. Exhaustion of *sancita karma* does not require free will. Since there is no free will, there is also no learning from the experience of karmaphalam.

Section 90 - Strong And Weak Prarabdha

Praarabdha is of two kinds – strong (*prabala*) and weak (*durbala*).. Atonement (*parihaaram*) for praarabdha is possible if it is durbala, not if it prabala and parihaaram such as yagna, puja, dhyaana, etc, can counteract or attenuate durbala praarabdha. In the case of miracles we hear about, the tapo sakti or yogic powers of the saint or yogi, applied by him in favour of his devotee, becomes a substitute for the devotee's own parihaara karma. The compassion of the pure mind of a jnanai can produce vibrations which can affect the natural forces in favour of the devotee..(Jnanan and Yoga are not connected. One

can be a jnani but not a yogi or one can be a yogi but not a yogi or one may be both. If a jnanaj is a yogi, he will exercise yogi powers only for loka sangraha.). If praarabdha is prabala, neither one's own parihaara karma or a tapo sakti of a saint or yogic power of a yogi can counteract the praarabdha. That is how we often find some people being benefited by approaching a saint or yogi but some others getting no benefit by approaching the same saint or yogi.

Section 91 - Correcting Others

If you are correcting a person because you have a feeling of being hurt by his action, it is wrong. But if, without such feeling, you want to correct the person in order to make him realise his mistake and as guidance for his future behaviour, correcting is all right.

Section 92 - Sanyasa And Grahastha In Relation To Moksha

Sanyasa is of two kinds – (1) *vividisha sanyasa*, sanyasa taken for srvanam, mananam and nididhyasanam, when one finds that that the preoccupations of secular life does not allow time for these. (2) vidwat sanyasa , sanyasa taken by a person who has aquired adequate jnanam by sravanam and mananam and adopts sanyasa asrama to ebgage himself exclusively in nididhasana. We can, perhaps, cite the example of Yagnavalkya.. However, Eeven a grahastha can get moksha through jnaanam. Cf. Gita 4th ch. Sloka 23. Sankaracarya accepts this in his bhashyam. He says, "If, on account of praarabdha, a person is unable to take sanyasa, say, compulsion of household duties, jnaanam cannot go without phaalam; he will also get moksha. The idea is is that in sanyaasa, more facilities are there for vedantic study. A grahastha has less facilities on account of preoccupation with worldly duties. That is why Sankaracarya, in many places insists on sanyaasa as the aasrama that is a must for pursuit of jnaana yoga. We have to take it that what Sankaracarya is emphasising is the practical point of view..

"*Iiswarasysa sankalpamaatrena sarvam aavirbhavati*". For the mind of jivas, there is a world outside the mind, as a vyaavahaarika phenomenon. But for Iswara, there is no world outside. The world is in Iswara, i.e., in Maya part of Iswara, whether it is in pralaya condition or srshti condition and Iswara, the consciousness aspect of Iswara knows that the world exists in his mind, as it were. Maya can be said to be Iswara's mind, Iswara knows that the world is in his mind, whether it in manifest for or unmanifest form.

Section 93 - Jivanmukta's Choice

On the vyaavahaarika plane, sarvaatmakatvam is related to Brahman being the satta of the entire range of superimposed nama roopa. In the paaramaarthika plane, there is no world; there is only the infinite non-dual Brahman. A Jivanmukta can have the sense of sarvaatmakatvam ("I am everything") and so lacking nothing, be contented and thus enjoy ananda, which is kosa ananda. Or he can have sense of himself being infinite. Dismissing the prapanca as non-existent, he can abide in brahmabhaava. This is also an antahkarana vritti, a sense of being all relative states. Perhaps, 'nirvriti' may be a word that gives an idea of it.

Section 94 - Visva, Taijasa, Praajna

The memory of an experience or knowledge is stored as memory in the mind. This is in the passive part of the mind. The passive part of the mind is *kaarana sariram*. This memory vritti is illumined by *karana sarira cidabhasa* called *praajna*. When you recollect it, the vritti is illumined by the *sukshma sarira cidabhasa* called *taijasa*. When the same suskshma sarira cidabhasa illumines a vritti pervading an object, it is called *visva* or *pramaata*

Section 95 - Known And The Unknown Lodged In Iswara

Ignorance of a thing in a particular antahkarana of a thing which is known by some other antahkaranas (e.g.,"I don't know Chinese") is also illumined by kaarana sarira cidabhasa. The knowledge, say,that I know Russian, is also illumined by kaarana sarira cidabhasa.

What about knowledge not discovered yet by any human being, e.g., the law of gravitation before Newton discovered it. It must exist somewhere. You cannot discover a non-existent thing? It exists in samashti karana sariram, Maya, and that it is illumined by cidabhaasa in Iswara.

Section 96 - Jnanabhrashta

Those who have studied Vedanta under a guru but fail to reach the stage of being a jivanmukta, in the current life, owing to some obstacle or other like some *vipariita bhavana,* called *jnaanabhrashta,* are reborn in a family and grow up in an environment conducive to the resumption of the study, with the advantage of the *samskara* (the carried-over *vasana*) of the study already done in the previous life. The example in Upanishads is the Vamadeva rishi who became a full-fledged jnani even while he is in the womb. In modern days, we can cite the case of Ramana Maharishi

Section 97 - Saamaanaadhikaranyam Lakshanaa

These are terms related to the technique of arriving at the implied meaning of a sentence.. When the words in a sentence in the same case denote the same object through different phrases, such words are said to be in samanadhikaranyam. The method of arriving at the implied meaning of the sentence is called lakshanaa.
The main lakshanaas are mentioned below.

a. Ahahal-lakshanaa, for the existing portion, substitute the following:- Where the vacyartha (the literal meaning of) a word in a sentence , as it is, is retained and to arrive at the lakshyartha (the

implied meaning) another word relating to the vacyartha is added, it is called ajahal-lakshanaa. The example is “The red is running (sona dhaavati”). Red, as a mere colour, can’t be running. So we add the word “horse” and arrive at “The red horde id running.”

b. Jahal-lakshana – Where one of the words in a sentence is rejected and a related word is substituted. Example “Village on Ganges”. A village cannot be located on a river. So, instead of the river, the bank of the river is adopted and we interpret the sentence to mean a”village on the bank of the Ganges”. Here, the words are said to be in “baadha samanadhkaranyam”.

c. Jahal-ajahal-lakshanaa – The mahavakyam “Tat tvam asi”. The vaacyaartha (the literal meaning) of “Tat” is omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent Iswara and the meaning of “Tvam” is the jiva with limited knowledge and powers and location. The word ‘asi” indicates that the two are one and the the same. This is not logical. So, we go to lakshyaartha (the implied meaning). Tat, Iswara ia mixrture of Brahma caitanyam, the real and cidabhasa and Maya, the mithya. Like that, tvam, jiva is a mixture of Brahma caitanyam (called pratyagatma), the real and and the body-mind complex,with cidabhassa, the unreal. Here we take real part of Tat and of Tvam and reject the mithya partsand equate the caitanyam called pratyagatma and the caitanyam called Brahman and interpret the sentence to mean “the consciousness in you and the consciousness that is Brahman are the same” (The teacher is saying this to the student).

Section 98 - Endless Entities

Apart from Brahman that is the paramarthika infinite, there are vyavaharika entities in regard to which it is not logical to say that they had a beginning as an event in time, So, we say that they are beginningless (anaadi). These vyavaharika entities are time itself, Maya, the cycle of creation and dissolution, Iswara , jiva and karma. Why we can’t say that time had a beginning is explained in Note No. 49..If Maya and Iswara are said to have a beginning, then we cannot explain creation. If the pair of cidabhasa part of Iswara, the intelligent cause and Maya, the material cause of the creation dissolution cycle is said to have a beginning, then we have to postulate a prior pair of causes for the origin of that

pair of causes and then, a still prior pair for that prior pair and so on. This will lead to infinite regress (anavastha doshai). So, there is no escape from saying that Iswara and Maya are beginningless. If creation is said to have a beginning, we cannot explain where was the pair o f the intelligent and material causes of creation at that time and when it did the first creation. We cannot postulate a point in space and a point of time for the existence of the pair of causes of creation, because then we have to talk of a prior space and a prior time and this will lead to infinite regress. So, we have no go but to accept a beginningless cycle of creation and dissolution. As regards Jiva and Karma, If we postulate a beginning for jiva, we have to say how did the punya papa responsible for the birth of the jiva arise and if we postulate a beginning for punya papa, we have to talk of a prior jiva who did karma in the form of actions in order to produce the punya papa. Thus we cannot but accept that jiva and karma also form a beginningless cycle.

Section 99 - Ramanuja's and Dwaitin's objections to the advaita concept of avidya

(Items of the debate that are too technical to be easily understood have been omitted)

Asrayaanupapatti – Logical inconsistency in regard to locus

Objection: Avidya (nescience) cannot have jiva as its locus of operation because the jiva himself is a product of Avidya. Nor can Avidya be located in Brahman because Brahman is self-effulgent knowledge and knowledge is opposed to nescience.

Refutation: .The objection is based on the misconception that there are two distinct real entities, Brahman and jiva and that Avidya is a third real entity. In Advaita, jiva is a mithya entitity, constituted by the association of Brahman with the mithya upadhi in the form of Avidya, or its product ,the intellect. (association in the form of a seemimg or actual reflection or conditioning, depending on the whether the prakriya is pratibimba vada or aabhasa vada or avacceda vada). Nescience (Avidya) is opposed not to Brahman as self-effulgent knowledge, pure consciousness (swaroopa jnanam) but to vrittijnanam, the combination of antahkarana and consciousness seeming to be reflected or actually reflected in or conditioned by the antahkarana. Therefore, there is no bar to Brahman being the locus

of Avidya. Even if jiva is taken as the locus of Avidya, there is no problem; because Avidya and Jiva are both mithya and equally beginningless.

Tirodhaanaanupapatti – logical inconsistency in regard to obscuration (aavaranam).

(This is another version of the discussion already included in Note No. 58.)

Objection: To hold that Avidya obscures Brahman which is eternal self-effulgence amounts to saying that the nature of Brahman is destroyed.

Refutation: The obscuration conceived in Advaita Vedanta is not actual blotting out of Brahman's effulgence. The obscuration (tirodhaanai) is in the form of jiva's nonapprehension of jiva himself being Brahman. This non-apprehension no more affects Brahman than a blind man's failure to see the sun or the formation of a cloud hiding the sun from a man's vision affects the sun..

Anirvacanayaanupapatti – The concept of non-categorisability is untenable.

Objection: The inability to categorise Avidya as either real or unreal is not tenable. All categories must be based on experience and experience has to be of either real or unreal entities.

Refutation - The definition of Avidya as neither real nor unreal (sadasadvilakshana) has t o be understood in the light of what is meant by sat (the real) and asat (theunreal). What is meant by the word sat (the real) is that which is not amenable to sublation at any time (past, present or future) (trikalaabaadhyami). What is meant by asat (the unreal) is that which does not appear to be real in any locus whatsoever. Avidya is vyavaharika. The pratibhasika example is rope-snake; it is not asat in the sense that it is not absolutely unreal like hare's horn or barren woman's son. Since the snake appears to be real in illusory experience in sem-darrknes. It is not absolutely real, because it is sublated when a light is directed at the rope. In the state of self-ignorance, Avidya appears to be real. But .when Brahman is known, it is sublated. Nivartakaanupapatti – Incapacity of Brahman-knowledge to sublate positive nescience.

Objection and refutation: For the Advaitin, the knowledge that sublates positive nescience must be that of nirguna Brahman. But Ramanuja says that Brahman is never without attributes and, in support, cites passages describing Brahman as a personal being with exalted attributes. Ramanuja explains even explicitly advaitic texts (e.g., "ekam eva advitiiyam") to suit his thesis that Brahman has

attributes. The point at issue is one of textual interpretation. The task is one of distinguishing passages meant for meditation (upasana) which is a part of the preparatory sadhana to qualify for jnanayoga, where Brahman with attributes is described from passages which explicitly present nirguna Brahman the knowledge of which is the means for liberation. There are numerous mantras in the Upanishads revealing Brahman as attributeless (nirguna) and mantras specifying that knowing nirguna Brahman one can get liberation.(Readers can refer to Part III, Section 4.) Nivrttyanupapatti

4. Objection; Positive nescience cannot be established at all. Ramanuja argues that since bondage is real, the knowledge of identity of Brahman and atma cannot abolish Avidya. Only the grace of God (Paramapurusha) moved by devotion can abolish real bondage. This position is also dogmatic and based on his concept of bondage. It is a part of the view of the ultimate reality being a personal God with jiva as a separate real entity and the jiva being in reality Brahman Itself whereas samsara undergone by jiva is due to jiva's ignorance of his real nature on account of the aavarana sakti of Avidya. As a saadhana, devotion (bhakti) is not ruled out in Advaita Vedanta but Advaitins maintain that, ultimately, liberation is only the abolition of the self-ignorance which must ensue the knowledge of nirguna Brahman and one's identity with that infinite Brahman.

- In the wake of Ramanuja, Venkatanatha asks in his Satadushani whether Avidya is different from Brahman or not. If different, Advaita breaks down. If not different, Brahman can never free Itself from it.

Advaitin's answer is that Avidya is a catdegory sui generis. It is sadasadvilakshanam in the sense explained above. The other word for that is mithya. Being mithya there is no question of affecting Brahman being non-dual and there is no danger to advaya. Though located in Brahman, it is of a lower order of reality, like the illusory snake located in the rope. The failure to appreciate the concept of mithya is at the root of Visishtadvaitin's and Dwaitin's objections.

Section 100 - Maya - Dwaitin's Objection Refuted

In the Pancapadika, Padmapada defines mithya as “being indefinable as “sat” (existence) or “asat” (non-existence). In Nyayamrita, Vyasatirtha raises an objection.

He asks “What is meant by sat and asat? Does it denote (a) negation of existence qualified by non-existence or (b) total negation of both existence and non-existence or (c) total negation of non-existence qualified by total negation of existence?

In Advaitasiddhi, Madhusudana Saraswati gives the answer. He says that (b) and (c) are entirely tenable. The main point to bear in mind is that in using the terms “existence” and “non-existence” in the definition of mithya, the Advaitin does not denote a contradictory or incompatible status. Both the judgments “the pot is existent” and “the rope-snake is existence” are intelligible. Yet, evidently, the kind of existence in the case of the pot is not the same as that of the rope-snake. In the case of the pot, existence denotes unsublatability (abaadhyatvam) in empirical experience, whereas in the case of the rope-snake, existence denotes existence which is liable to sublation in empirical experience, as evidenced by the later judgment , “this is not snake”. When Advaitin talks about the world being mithya, different from being real or unreal (“sadasadvilakshana”), the word ‘sat’ is used to mean nonsublatability at any time (trikalaabadhyam”) and the word ‘asat’ is used to mean unfitness to appear as existent in any locus (i.e., the utterly non-existent like the hare’s horn – ‘tuccam’). Therefore what is meant by saying that the world is mithya is that while, located in Brahman, it does appear and is experienced, with jivas attributing reality to the world (which includes the body-mind complex) in the state of ignorance. It is negated, i.e., dismissed as unreal when they come to know Brahman, the paramarthika reality and in the paramarthika plane it is totally non-existent. Thus for Brahman, the universe is non-existent, whereas for the jivas, it is existent, in two forms, appearing to be real for the ignorant and known to be false for the knower of Brahman. It is this unique combination of non-existence and existence that is called mithya.

Section 101 - Recapitulation of the important points in the teaching

Brahman is the only reality. The nature of Brahman is Existence-Consciousness-Infinity (satyam jnanam anantam).

For Brahman, there is no universe. But we, living beings (jivatmas) experience a universe. The universe is unreal. In the universe, itself, there are certain things which we regard as real when we experience it but which turn out to be false later.

To accommodate this phenomenon, Advaita Vedanta postulates three orders of reality, (a) the absolute (paramarthika), in which category Brahman alone is, (b) the empirical (vyavaharika) in which category the perceived part of the world experienced by us in the waking state falls and (c) illusory (pratibhasika) in which the world that we experience during the dream state falls, as also erroneous perceptions like a snake being seen on a rope, space being seen as blue etc. The universe that we experience is a mixture of existence belonging to Brahman, the sub-stratum, and nama roopa (attributes like shape, color etc. of things and the characteristics of our body and mind) superimposed on the sub-stratum. The sub-stratum is real and unchanging. The nama roopa which are superimposed on it is unreal and changing. Not only do individual nama roopa undergo change, but the whole set of nama roopa changes in a cycle of differentiation (srishti) and resolution into a seed form (laya). The one who is responsible for this srishti and laya is an entity called Iswara, constituted of an unreal thing, called Maya, located in Brahman, in which the conscious aspect of Brahman (Brahma caitanyam) is reflected (or seems to be the original corresponding to the seeming reflectioion or by which Brahma caitanyam is conditioined, depending on the different prakriyas). With the conscious aspect, Iswara visualizes creation and from the matter aspect, which is Maya, the nama roopa which are in seed form are unfolded by Maya through its vikshepa sakti. We jivas are a mixture of the indivisible Brahma caitanyam, available for recognition as consciousness behind our mind, specially during sushupti (called atma or sakshi caitanyam), the subtle body (sukshma sarira including the mind) in which Brahma caitanyam is reflected (or seems to be reflected or by which Brahma caitasyam is conditioned, depending on the different prakriyas) and the physical body. Our real nature is Brahma caitanyam. The rest of us is unreal. But, owing to the veiling power (avarana sakti) of Maya, we are ignorant of our real nature as brahma caitanyam and identifying ourselves with our body and

mind and regard ourselves as limited individuals. Atma is devoid of instruments of knowledge and action; It is neither a doer (karta) nor an enjoyer (bhokta) but though we are really the atma, we have the false notion that we are the doers and enjoyers and with the aid of ahamkara (the antahkarana with the association of brahma caitanyam,) interact with objects of the world and other jivatmas. In the process, we undergo suffering and enjoyment. The suffering and enjoyment among the jivatmas is unequal and not related to current actions and thoughts. This is due to the law of karma, according to which for whatever actions we do or thoughts we entertain we incur puny papa and have to pay a price in the form of suffering and enjoyment in future janmas. Iswara is the administrator of the law of karma (karmaphaladata). He designs each creation and each janma of a jivatma, correlating the punya papa and the objects, surroundings and situations of the universe as well as the physical and mental equipment of the jivatmas. The cycle of srshti, sthithi, laya, the jivatmas, karma, Iswara and Maya are beginningless (anaadi) . Jivatmas have a free will by which they can alter the prarabdha , the fructified part of punya papa allotted for suffering or enjoyment in the future in this life and add punya to the accu.mulation of punya papa bundle (sancita). In deed it is only by free will a jiva is enabled to do preparatory sadhanas and pursue jnana yoga and attain liberation from samsara. The means of liberation from the cycle of action and thoughts, rebirths and enjoyment and suffering (called samsara) is knowledge of identity with Brahma caitanyam (jivabrahma- aikya jnanam). To gain this knowledge and assimilate it, one has to study sastra (the core of it is the Upanishads) under the guidance of a teacher (guru) who has come in the lineage of the teacher-student succession (gurusishya parampara) and who has himself gained and assimilated jiva-brahma-aikya-jnanam (srotriya brahmanishta). The preparatory spiritual practice to gain what is called sadahana catushtaya samaptti (sadhana) consists of karma yoga and upasana. Thereafter we have to study sastra under a guru who is srotriya brahmanishta. Listening to the teacher expounding and interpreting the sastra is called sravanam. Getting remaining doubts cleared by reflection and discussion with the guru is called mananam. Emptying the mind of the notions and attitudes born out of the identification with the body mind in janma after janmas by dwelling on the teaching of sastra to accomplish total, mental identification with Brahma caitanyam is called nididhyasana. If this course of sravanam, mananam

and nididhyasanam is gone throughsuccessfully, one gets liberated from samsara. One attains moksha). Moksha is only discovering what was hidden from us, i.e., our real nature as the infinite Brahman. The benefit is unalloyed peace and happiness. It is possible to get moksha in the very life in which one gains jiva-brahma-aikya jnanam. A person who has gained jivabrahma-aikya jnanam is called a jivanmukta. For a jivanmukta, death is disintegration of all the three bodies (the sthoola, sukshma and karana). This is called videha mukti. From the vyavaharic point of view, it is merging in Iswara. From the paramartika point of view, one has ever been Brahma caitanyam, The only change that takes place is the disappearance of the mithya individuality.

ANNEXURE I - PRAKRIYA BEDHA IN AVAITA VEDANTA

Section 1

1. Upanishads do speak of Brahman being the cause of the universe Tu.2.1.1. – "Satyam Jnanam Anantam Brahma.....From that, this Atma space was born, from space air……. and from food man." Tu 2.6.1 – "He (Brahman[1]) wished, 'let me be many, let me be born'. He visualized the universe to be created. Having visualized, He created this whole universe. Then He entered into it. Having entered, He became the gross and the subtle, the defined and the undefined, the sustaining and the non-sustaining, the sentient and the insentient, the true and the untrue." At the same time, the Upanishads say that Brahman is non-dual, eternal, immutable, divisionless, partless, changeless, is neither cause nor effect and is devoid of instruments of desire, visualization, cogitation, conception, ratiocination etc and of action. Bu 3.8.8, Mu 2.1, Su 6.8 – "It (Brahman), is the Immutable (aksharam) – which does not decay or perish - is devoid of the sense organs (eyes and ears, vocal organs), of mind …….and of. praana***[2]*** ; Ka 21, Mu 1.1.6, Su 3.19 – " It (Brahman) is devoid of hands and feet."; Muktikpanishad 1.3. - "changeless ('sakshinam nirvikarinam)"; Su VI.11 – "It is devoid of attributes (nirguna); Bu III.viii.viii – " It is without mind" (amanah); Su VI.19 – "It is partless, divisionless, actionless" (nishkalam, nishkriyam); Bu 2.5.19 – That Brahman is without prior or posterior (apoorvam anaparam)" (i.e. It is neither cause nor effect); Ku 1.2.14 – " Different from cause and effect (anyatra krtaat akkrtaat)"; Ku 1.2.18 – "It did not originate from anything nor did anything originate from It";. Bu 4.3.32, Cu 6.2.1, Kau 23, Mau 7 – "It (Brahman) is non-dual", It is without a second (advaita, advitiiiya)". Reconciling the two sets of statements in the Upanishads, implicitly in Upanishads and, explicitly in Smritis and Prakarana granthas, a qualified Brahman, of a lower order of reality than the attributeless (nirguna) Brahman, called Iswara,, constituted by a semblance or

reflection of Brahman-consciousness (Brahma caitanyam) in Maya or Brahma caitanyam conditioned by the adjunct of Maya (Mayaroopa upaadhi avaccinna) is taught as the creator; the consciousness aspect functions as the intelligent cause of the universe and the Maya aspect functions as the material cause, under the guidance of the former.. Su 1.9 talks of one who knows that Jiva, Iswara and Maya are nothing but Brahman becoming a Jiivanmukta. [This is achieved when the jiva overcomes the ignorance of his true nature as Brahman, engendered by Maya, and in that state of ignorance attributes reality to himself, the individual with limited knowledge, the omniscient Iswara and Maya which produces the bhokta and the bhogyam (i.e. the body-mind complex and the material universe); along with the understanding of his true nature as Brahman, he realizes that the sole real substance is Brahman and jivas, jagat, Iswara and Maya are all mithya] In this way, this mantra distinguishes the vyaavahaarika Iswara from the paaramaarthika Brahman. In Mu 1.1.9, the universe is said to be born from the omniscient (sarvajna) and the knower of all (sarvavid). Mandukya Upanishad mantra 6, describes the caitanyam in sushupti as sarveswara (which Sankaracarya interprets as the ruler of the universe of diversity) as omniscient, as the Inner Controller (antaryaami) and the source of the origination and resolution of all jivas. The significance is that according to this Upanishad which talks of four paada's of Brahman, sushupti is the third paada. This is described in mantra 6 as prajnaanaaghana and aanandamaya, as distinguished form the fourth paada. The fourth paada is non-dual Brahman, called by people as turiiya., This is said in mantra 7 to be not even prajnaanaghana. (In Sankaracarya's commentary, he says that it is different from the qualified consciousness like the waking, dream and deep sleep states). Cu 3.14.1 and 3.14.2 talk of Brahman from whom everything is born, and in whom everything exists and dissolves, one who appears like the mind and praana as his body, one whose wishes are fulfilled infallibly, (satyasankalpah), as the performer of all actions, as being possessed of all desires ….. and as free from desires. (In his commentary, Sankaracarya draws a parallel for 'being possessed of desires' from Bhagawadgita 7.11, which talks of the Lord being the virtuous desires of jivas and interprets 'one free from desires' as one all of whose desires have been fulfilled (aaptakamah)

and hence is ever contented (nityatrptah). In CU 6.2.3, Tu 2.6.1, Au 1.1.1, , Brahman is said to have visualized the creation of the universe and desired to become many. Thus we have enough indication in the Upanishads themselves that it is not nirguna Brahman but a Brahman possessing a mind and qualified with omniscience (sarvajantvam) and omnipotence (sarva satyatvam) (a guna visishta brahman or saguna brahman) that is intended to be taught in the Upanishads as the intelligent cause of the world. As regards material cause, Sv 10.4 talks of Maya as the material cause (prakriti) and the great Lord (Maheswara) to be its master (controller).

2. There are numerous passages in the Upanishads indicating the unreality of the world. Tu 2.6.1 indicates three orders of reality :
   (a) absolute reality (paaramaarthika satyam),
   (b) empirical reality (vyaavahaarika satyam and
   (c) subjective reality (praatibhaasika satyam). Unconditioned, attributeless Brahman alone (nirupaadhika, nirguna Brahman) alone is paaramaarthika satyam.
   The entire universe including the saguna Brahman, Iswara, Maya and the bodies and minds of living beings is vyaavahaarika satyam. In the category of praatibhaasika satyam fall one's own dream world perceived by one, exclusive of what each one of the others perceives as their own and illusory objects like snake perceived on the rope, silver on the shell, water on desert sand, castle in the cloud blueness in the sky etc. By a harmonious reading of Cu 6.1,4-6, 6.2,1, 6,3,2, 6.8.4, 6. 8.7, 6.15.1 Bu 1.4.7, 1.4.10, 1.6.1 etc, we also learn that the real sub-stratum of the universe is Brahman as Existence and the material things and the bodies and minds of jivas perceived as differentiated objects are unreal forms to which names have been given and are superimposed on Existence. The world of names and form is experienced but is negated as unreal when the reality, Brahman, is known. To designate this status of the world which we cannot categorize as either existent or non-existent, the term, mithya, is introduced. The mithya status of the universe , i.e., the superimposed names and forms consisting of attributes which give the universe objective perceptibility is indicated in such texts as Bu 2.3.6 - "Not this, not

this,…….Now Its name; 'the Truth of truth' The praana is truth and it is the Truth of that" (prana stands for all nama roopa), Cu 7.23.1 -"The finite is the state where one sees something else, hears something else, and knows something else….that which is finite is mortal", Cu 6.1.4 etc. - "All transformation is only a name initiated by the tongue", Brhadaranyaka 4.3.31 - "When there is something else, as it were, one can see something …..one can know something", Pu 3.3, " From the Atma (from the all-pervading, immutable Brahman), this praana is born, like the shadow of a man ('praana' stands for all nama roopa)", Bu 4.4.19, Ku 2.1.10, 2.1.11 - "There is no manifoldness whatsoever in This (Brahman) . He who sees difference, as it were, is caught in the cycle of birth and death.", Bu 3.5.1 – Everything except Brahman is perishable" .

3. Su 4.10 read with Bu 1.4.7 teach us that Maya which was in undifferentiated form has evolved into differentiated names and forms which we see as the objects of the universe. That Maya itself is of a lower order of reality is indicated in Mu 2.1.2 which talks of Brahman as superior to the superior aksharam. (- In his commentary, Sankaracarya explains that the word, 'aksharam' in this context, refers to the unevolved (avyaakrta i.e., Maya, which is the seed of and hence said to be superior to its products in the form of body mind complexes (kaaryakaranasanghaata) and the nirupaadhika Brahman is superior to Maya. We can also justify the word 'aksharam' because the manifestation of nama roopa is a cycle without beginning or end). We can derive the conclusion that Maya functions under the guidance of an intelligent entity when we read Mu 3.1.3 and Kau 6 which talk of Brahman being the source of brahmaa (Hiranyagarbha) along with Bu first chapter section 2, where Hiranyagarbha is said to create the five elements and the living beings including gods and demons and animals.

4. That the essential nature of living beings (jivas) is the indivisible infinite Brahman-Consciousness (Brahma caitanyam) is declared in the four mahaavaakyas, (Jiva's consciousness is Brahman" (prajnaanam Brahma - Au – Rg Veda)", "I am Brahman (aham brahma asmi – Bu - Sukla Yajur Veda", "Thou art That" (tattvamasi – Cu - Sama Veda), " This Atma is Brahman" (ayamaatama Brahma" (Mu - Atharva Veda) and numerous other statements which are tantamount to mahavakyas. The one non-dual, attributeless Brahman (nirguna Brahma) which

is pure consciousness appearing as manifold knower consciousnesses in jivas, with attributes is indicated in such Upanishadic texts such as the following :- Cited in BSB 3.2.18 - "As this luminous sun, though one in itself, becomes multifarious owing to its entry into water divided by different pots, similarly this Deity, the birthless, self-effulgent atma, though one, seems to be diversified owing to Its entry into the different bodies, constituting Its limiting adjuncts", Amritabindu Upanishad 12 - "Being but one, the Universal Soul is present in all beings. Though one, It is seen as many, like the moon in water" Bu 2.5.19, Ku 2.2.9, 2.2.10 - "(Having entered the nama roopa consisting of the body mind complexes of the jivas,) the atma became the replicas of these different nama roopas… [The comparison, in Sankarycarya's commentary in Bu is the children being born in the forms similar to their parents. In Ku, the Upanishad gives the example of fire assuming the shape of the different forms of substances which are interested in it (like iron rod) and of vayu assuming different forms as praana in different bodies] the likeness assumed is for the purpose of revealing Itself (In his commentary in Bu, Sankaracarya explains that, if there was no manifestation of nama roopa brought about by Maya, the nirupaadhika Brahman cannot be known. The atrtibuteless caitanyam can be recognised only through the caitanyam in the mind-complexes.). Cu 6.3.3 - "Brahman entered into the three gods – fire, water and earth – (not in Its original form) but in the form of jivatmas".

5. As indicated in Kau 12 and Krishna Upanishad 12, human beings are deluded by Maya; forgetting their true nature. They identify themselves with their body mind complexes, take themselves to be limited individuals and the world of names and forms to be real. With a sense of being a doer (kartrtvam) and enjoyer (bhokrutvam), they transact with other human beings and objects of the world, undergo the cycle of action , results of action, birth and death, enjoyment and suffering, together called samsaara

Section 2

The cardinal doctrines of Advaita Vedanta accepted by all Acaryas on the basis of Upanishad passages such as those cited above are –

1. The absolute reality (paaramaarthika satyam) is Brahman, which is Existence-Consciousness-Infinity (satyam jnanam anantam). It is non-dual (advidiiyam), immutable (nirvikara), attributeless (nirvisesha), partless, divisionless (nishkalam), actionless (nishkriya), devoid of a mind (amanah). It is neither cause nor effect.
2. We perceive and infer a universe of innumerable objects and the bodies and minds of living beings and are aware of our own bodes and minds. But these all only unreal forms, constituted of various attributes, with corresponding names (nama roopa) that are superimposed (adhyasta) on a real sub-stratum, Brahman, the Existence principle. The superimposition of nama roopa is done by an entity called Maya, associated with Brahman, which can neither be categorized as existent or non-existent. What we experience is a combination of the real Existence and the unreal nama roopa. What we perceive is the unreal nama roopa. The lower order of reality of Maya as well as the nama roopa which Maya unfolds as creation of the universe is called vyaavahaarika satyam (empirical reality).
3. Jivas, in their true nature, are identical with Brahman, being the same homogenous indivisible consciousness. (Viewed from the angle of the jivas, the same consciousness is called atma).
4. The ignorance of jivas of their true nature as the infinite Brahman and their false notion that there is a real world of plurality and they themselves are limited individuals is a delusion (adhyaasa) caused by Maya.
5. On account of the adhyaasa, jivas interact with the objects and other jivas with a sense of doership and likes and dislikes and undergo a cycle (called samsaara) consisting of good and bad action and thought, involving merit and demerit (punya and papa, together called karma), transmigration from one janma to another to undergo the

consequence of the fructified punya papa part of their accumulated karma (karmaphalam) through suffering and enjoyment.

6. Liberation from samsaara (called moksha) takes place when jiva in his janma on earth or in any of the higher lokas discovers his true nature through study of scripture under the guidance of a preceptor (guru). This discovery (jnanam) can take place happen while one still alive. One who has thus gained jnanam and perfected it is called jivanmukta. And when his physical body dissolves, the subtle body and causal body dissolve and 'he merges in Brahman'. This is called videhamukti.

Section 3

1. In so far as the teaching of the doctrines of Advaita Vedanta is concerned, there are different methodologies (prakriyas). All of them are based on Sankaracarya's commentaries (bhashyams) on ten principal Upanishads, the Brahma Sutra of Vyasacarya and the Bhagavadgita and his treatises like Upadesa Sahasri, Vakyavritti, Atmabodha, Tattvabodha and Vivekacudamani .The prakriyas are mainly three.
2. One is aabhaasa vaada, initiated by Sureswaracarya, author of verse sub-commentaries called Vartika on Sankaracarya's bhashyams of Taittiriya Upanishad and Brhadaranyaka Upanishad Bhashya Vaartika, Manasollasa, a commentary on Sankarycarya's Dakshinamurtistotram and Pranavavartika. Abhasavada has been refined by Vidyaranya, author of Pancadasi,
3. Another is pratibimba vaada initiated by Padmapada author Pancapadika, a sub-commentary on Sankarycarya's Bhashya on the first four chapters of Brahma Sutra and refined by Prakasatman in his work called Vivarana.
4. The third is avacceda vaada initiated by Vacaspati Misra of Bhamati.
5. The differences are mainly in regard to the manner in which Maya is associated with Brahman to become the creator of the universe and how the jivas are constituted.

6. In aabhaasa vaada, the creator is Iswara, , constituted by a reflection of Brahma caitanyam in the upadhi called avidya (Maya). And jiva is constituted by a reflection of Brahma caitanyam in the upadhi in the form of intellect, which is a product of avidya (Maya). The reflection is as unreal as the upadhi (is vyavaharika satyam), whereas Brahma caitanyam is paramarthika satyam. The reflection in both cases is different from Brahma caitanyam and functions as a secondary consciousness, as a knower-consciousness. To emphasise this difference, it is sometimes denoted as a 'semblance of brahma caitanyam', as cit-aabhaasa (cidabhasa), though the expression 'reflected consciousness' (pratibimba caitanyam) and the expression cidabhasa are used indiscriminately. Whatever be the expression, the phenomenon is that, in the all pervading presence of Brahma caitanyam, Iswara and Jiva acquire a consciousness which, in the case of Iswara is an omniscient consciousness and, in the case of jiva a differentiating knower-consciousness, different from the nirguna Brahman, the eternal non-objectifying consciousness. All the same it is a mithya nama roopa. In the case of jiva, the adhyasa consists in mistaking the mithya nama roopa to be real. Iswara functions with the omniscient consciousness, which is also mithya but knows that it is mithya.
7. In Pratibimba vaada, the creator is Brahman acquiring the adventitious status as the prototype (bimba), corresponding to the reflection (pratibimba) of Brahma caitanyam in Maya which is jiva. The bimba is called Iswara. In Avacceda vaada, the creator is Brahman acquiring the qualities of omniscience (sarvajnatvam) and omnipotence (sarvasatimatvam) by the conditioning by the upaadhi, Maya. The conditioned Brahman is called Iswara.
8. In Pratibimba vaada, the jiva is the reflection of Brahma caitanyam in Maya. What appears as a reflection is Brahma caitanyam itself. It is thought by jivas to be different owing to the delusion (adhyaasa) caused by Maya. In Avacceda vaada, jiva is Brahma

caitanyam enclosed by the intellect. It is non-different from Brahma caitanyam but jivas deluded by aviyda located in the intellect, mistake it to be different.

9. Sureswaracarya says that whatever be the prakriya, as long as people attain firm knowledge of jiva brahma aikyam by adopting that prakriya, that prakriya is valid. It is a question what prakriya appeals to a person's intellect.
10. "There is a doctrine called *drshti-srshti-vaada* propounded by an Advaita preceptor called Prakasananda (circa sixteenth century). According to this doctrine, which denies the objective existence of the world-phenomenon, all penomena are subjective; the mind creates the objects; an object is nothing but its perception. The jug that I see had no existence before I perceived it and it will also cease to be as soon as I cease to have the perception of it; if I go out of my house which I was perceiving and come back and perceive a house, it is not the same house, but a new house created by the mind. In this doctrine, there is no common factor such as Maya; the perceived objects are modifications of the individual's ajnana; they are illusory superimpositions on the real sub-stratum, Brahman. Each of a number of persons may perceive a snake and run away; that does not imply that, out there, there is a snake in space and time. Like that the table or chair each of us perceives is just an idea in the mind of each of us. In a variation of this doctrine, Maya is accepted and jiva is regarded as the reflection of Brahma caitanyam in Maya. Since there is only one Maya, there is only one vyaavahaarika jiva. In this also, there is no objective existence of the world-phenomenon. Not only that, for this one jiva, all other jivas are creations of his mind; like objects of the world, they are all pratibhasikam. This is called *eka jiva vaada*. In another variant, there is not even a single vvyavaharika jiva; everything except Brahman is pratibhasikam. But these doctrines which are riddled with logical problems have not found acceptance among Advaita Vedanta preceptors (acaryas) in general." As regards the other prominent prakriyas, id we do a comprehensive anaysis, we can say,

with aceertain amount of confidence that Sankaracarya, Sreswaracarya and Vidyaranya were inclined to prefer abhasa vada.

Section 4

The details of the manner in which Sankaracarya, Vidyaranya, Prakasatman and Vacaspati Misra have dealt with the topics of creation and Jiva are given in Topic II of this Annexure.

ANNEXURE II - SANKARACARYA, SURSWARACARYA, VIDYARANYA, PRAKASATMAN, VACSPATI MISRA

Section 1 - Sankaracarya

1. Creation

1. In TUB 2.6.1 (commenting on the passage in Tu which describes creation – 'idam sarvam asrjata….satyam ca anrtam ca satyam abhavat') Sankaracarya talks of three orders of reality – Brahman as the sole absolute reality (ekam eva hi paramaartha satyam brahmaa….satyam jnaanam anantam) from which everything in creation is born and of creation consisting of relative reality, i.e. empirical phenomena like water which has a higher order of reality compared to mirage (vyavahaaravishayam aapekshikam satyam) and absolutely false things like mirage (anrtam) (Satyam ca vyavahaaravishayam-adhikaaraat-na-paramaarthasatyam. Ekam- eva hi paramaarthasatyam brahma. Iha punah-vyavahaaraharavishayam-aapekshikamekam satyam, mrgatrshnikaadi-anrta-apekshaya-udakaadi-satyam ucyate. Anrtam ca tat-vipariitam. Kim punah 'etat sarvam abhavata'? satyam paramaartha satyam. Kim punah tat? Brahma, satyam jnaanam-anantam brahma-iti prkrtatvaat). Thus, Sankaracarya explains this part of Taittiriya II.vi.i as the pramaanam (authority) for the Advaitic doctrine of three orders of reality –

(a) absolute reality (paaramaartika satyam) which is the unconditioned, attributeless, non-dual Brahman (nirupaadhika, nirguna, advidiiya Brahman) ,

(b) empirical reality (vyaavahaarika satyam) which is the entire universe of nama roopa including the qualified Brahman (saguna Brahman, Iswara), Maya and the bodies and minds of living beings

(c) subjective reality (praatibhaasika satyam), which is the kind of things like the dream world (swapna prapanca), the mirage etc.

2. (a) In the first chapter of BSB, Sankaracarya starts talking of Brahman as the material and intelligent cause of the universe (upaadaana kaaranam and nimitta kaaranam respectively and as the omniscient and omnipotent source of the manifestation of name and form (naama roopa) that are associated with diverse agents and experiences, actions and results, with well regulated space, time and causation and as the ordainer and designer of the manifestation. But all this is in the context of refuting the Sankya thesis that pradhaana (equated with Maya), an insentient entity, is the material cause of the universe, Later, however, in BSB 1.1.12, he clarifies that Brahman is known two aspects – one as qualified by the upaadhi in the form of the varieties of modification of name and form (nama-roopa-vikaara-bheda-upaadhi-visishtam) and the other free of all upaadhis (sarva –upaadhi-varjitam). When he comes to the second Chapter of Brahma Sutra, he points out that Brahman cannot undergo change, and explains, in BSB 2.1.14, that the one becoming many as nama roopa is an empirical (vyavaharika) phenomenon conjured up by Avidya; all notions of differences and of the division of the experiencer and the experienced are due to unreal nama roopa conjured up by Avidya and are there only in a state of ignorance and that rulership (iisritatvam), omniscience (sarvajnatvam) and omnipotence (sarvasaktitvam) are relevant only in the empirical plane; in the plane of absolute reality (paaramaartika), there are no empirical transactions. . In BUB 3.8.12 and AUB 3.1.3, he says that the transcendental Brahman, devoid of all attributes and all action, pure, non-dual, eternal becomes, by the association of the upaadhi of extremely pure knowledge (atyanta-visuddha-prajna-upaadhi-sambandhena) becomes the Omniscient , Iswara and is known as antaryaami by virtue of his activator and controller of the activity of the unmanifested seed of the universe (sarvajnam iiswaram-sarva-

saadhaarana-avyaakrta-jagat-bija-pravartakam niyatrutvaat antaryaami samjam bhavati); when it has the upadhis of the bodies and minds and sense organs, characterised by ignorance, desire and action, It is called the transmigrating individual (samsaari jiva). In TB 9, he defines Iswara as Brahman conditioned by Maya. (In VC, the synonyms of Maya are given as avyaakrta, avyakta, and ajnaana. (The word, prakriti is also a synonym. The term, pramaanam used in Sankhya philosophy also refers to the material cause of the universe, but there, it is as real as Brahman, whereas in Advaita, Maya is of a lower order of reality).

(b) In BSB 2.3.42 and BSB 3.2.38, while he deals with karmaphalam, he introduces it as the vyaavahaarika aspect of Brahman in the form of the division between the ruler and the ruled and says that the ordainer of karmaphalam is Iswara; logically, it is Iswara who is the ordainer of karmaphalam. For it is He alone who presides over everything and because of his knowledge of the variegated environments, time and events involved in the process of creation, preservation and dissolution, He alone is in a position to ordain karmaphalam in accordance with the karma of Jivas; the inequality in the karmaphalam of jivas is due to the differences in their karma; Iswara is only an instrument for apportioning karmaphalam in accordance with the karma of jivas and (as he clarifies in BSB 2.1.34) there is no question of partiality or cruelty on the part of Iswara. In TB 9, Sankaracarya defines Iswara as Brahman conditioned by Maya

(c) In BSB 1.4.3, Sankaracarya refers to the power called avyakta without which the creatorship of the supreme God (parameswara) cannot be logically explained and to its subservience to and dependence on parameswara; the dependence of Maya on Brahman is mentioned also in Tattvabodha 7.1., 7.2 and 7.3, BSB 1.4.3 and BSB 1.2.12. In PB 105, he makes a distinction between Maya and Avidya; he says that Maya is dependent on Brahman and Avidya is dependent on jiva (maaya-brahmopagataa-avidya jiivaasraya prokta).

(d) Citing Mundakopanishad 2.1.2 and Swesvatara Upanishad 4.10 ('Know Maya to be Prakriti and Maheswara, the great God to be maayii, the master of Maya, Sankaracarya reiterates Brahman's superiority over avyakta which is the seed of nama roopa. The lower of reality of Maya is also indicated in his bhashyam on Mundakopanishad 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 – 'The nature of this Maya is to be inferred from the fact of its being the limiting adjunct (upaadhi) of that higher Immutable – the Purusha….formless, birthless…without a second.

(e) In TB 7.1, Maya, depending for its existence on Brahman, is said to be of the nature of the three gunas, satva, rajas and tamas. In VC 113, 115, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146 , Sankaracarya says that Maya brings forth the universe with moveable and immoveable (objects); he talks of the projecting power (vikshepa sakti) of Maya, pertaining to rajas and the veiling power (aavarana sakti) of Maya, pertaining to tamas; the vikshepa sakti is of the nature of activity (i.e. creation of the world); it is also the cause of the wrong projection by jiva and the human activity and jiva and the mental modifications like attachment, pain, grief, etc.; like raahu concealing the orb of the sun, the aavarana sakti envelops the infinite, eternal, non-dual Brahman; By ignorance caused by the aavarana sakti, man takes unreal things to be real and is caught up in bondage (samsaara).

(f) In VC 111 and PB 99 Sankaracarya says that Maya is neither existent nor non-existent, neither different (from Brahman) nor non-different (from Brahman), neither with parts or without parts. It is very wonderful and of a form which is inexpressible (sannapyasannaapyubhyaatmikaa no bhinnabhyabhinnaapyubhyaatmikaa no sangaapyaasangaapyubhayaatmiko no mahaatbhootaa-anirvacaniiyaroopaa).

(g)In VC 200, Sankaracarya says that Avidya and its effects are beginningless.

(h) That Maya is of a lower order of reality than Brahman is indicated by Sankaracarya in MUB 2.1.2 (Mu – "Purusha is transcendental.... He is pure and superior to the superior immutable (divya hi amoortah purushah sabaahyaantarah hi ajaah apraanah hi amanah subhrah hi aksharaat paratah parah) (MUB – akshara-naama roopa-bijopaadhi-lakshita-swaroopaaat sarva-kaarya-karana-biijatvena-upalaksshyamaanatvaatt-param tattvam tat-upaadhi-lakshanam avyaakrtam-avyayam –aksharam sarva-vikaarebhyah tasmaat-paratah-aksharaat-parah nirupaadhikah purushah iti-arthah).

(i)The unreality of the world i.e., the superimposed nama roopa is mithya, as distinguished from the adhishtaanam, Brahman, as Existence) is brought out in many parts of Sankaracarya's commentaries and in his other works - e.g., BUB 2.1.20 - The relative conditions of the transcendent atma are erroneous, like the notion of that a crystal is red or any other colour owing to its association with its upadhis. US 17.13 – This universe is unreal. Existence-Consciousness alone is real. It is the forms only that are unreal. US 19.10 – Unreal like the circular form of a burning torch (alaatacakravat), superimposition has no existence independent of that of the non-dual Atma. BSB 2.1.33 – The Vedic statement of creation does not relate to any reality……such a text is valid only within the range of activities pertaining to name and form conjured up by Avidya and the purpose is to teach the fact that everything is Brahman. US 16.35 – All the modifications of Maya are to be understood to be unreal on the basis of Sastra which says that they are nothing but words. US 17.29, 30 – Just as a magician comes and goes on an elephant (created by his own magic), so also, Atma, though devoid of all motion, appears to be undergoing conditions such as Hiranyagarbha, waking, dream, deep sleep etc., none of which has real existence.

3. From a harmonious construction of what has been cited above, we can conclude that according to Sankaracarya, the attributeless Brahman (nirguna Brahma) is neither the intelligent cause (nimitta kaaranam) nor the material cause (upaadaana kaaranam) of the universe; the intelligent cause of creation and the guiding factor for Maya being the material cause of creation is a qualified Brahman (saguna brahma), Brahman with May as upaadhi; Maya is the material cause of creation, in the sense of seed of nama roopa evolving into manifested nama roopa and being superimposed (adhyastam, aropitam) on the reality, the nirguna Brahman.

2. Jiva

1. Sankaracarya's description of jiva seems to the fore runner of all the three prakriyas. TUB 2.6.1, he talks of jiva as being perceived in the cavity of the intellect, as possessed of such distinctions as being a seer, a thinker, a knower etc. In BUB 2.1.14, he talks of Brahman conforming to upadhis, like space conforming to pots, jars, etc. (The example of space in pot, jar, cave etc. is also given in BSB 1.1.5, BSB 2.3.7 and MUB 2.1.1 for the conditioning of the consciousness by the intellect whereas in US 12.1, he talks of the intellect as being pervaded by a semblance of pure consciousness. In US 5.4, he says that the modifications of the intellect are pervaded by the reflection of consciousness and in BUB 1.4.7, he says that atma is perceived in the as a reflection of sun etc, in water and the like. In PB 114, he says that the Pure Consciousness which is reflected in the intellect is called the jiva and the jiva causes the manifestation of (the sense) of "I" in the body. In PB 117 and 118, he says that just as the light of the sun which is reflected in the vessels made of bell metal and the like, having entered into the interior of a house, illumines other objects, the reflection of pure consciousness in the

intellects which has become the jiva, illumines the objects outside through the paths of the eyes and other senses. In 4.3.7, he talks of atma imparting its luster to the intellect like an emerald dropped in milk. In MUB 3.2.7, both the comparison of pot space and reflection in sun, moon etc. in water appear in the commentary on the mantra which talks of the fifteen constituents of the body going back to their sources. The various terms that he uses are caitanya-pratibimba (reflection of consciousness – US 5.4, drasht-aabhaasa (semblance or false replica of the witness-consciousness – US 12.1, chaaya (shadow – US 14.33), caitanya aabhaasa (semblance or false replica of consciousness- US) atma-aabhaasa (semblance or false replica of atma) – US 18.53 aabhaasa (semblance or false replica) – US 18.107, 18.120).

2. Even though it seems that Sankaracarya does not preclude from the teaching any of the three prakriyas, the weight seems to be in favor of aabhaasa vaada, and not pratibimba vaada or avacceda vaada. The extracts below would support this view.
   (a) In BUB 1.4.7, the opponent asks" If Paramatma has entered, the jivas entered into being subject to samsaara, Paramatma will also become subject to samsaara and will be happy, miserable and so on. Sankaracarya's answer is "No, the perception of (of misery) etc. are the objects of only the particular form that Paramatma takes owing to the Its being the support of Its upaadhi (i.e., the intellect.).
3. In CUB 6.3.2, the opponent asks "Is it not incongruous for the omniscient Deity, not being a samsaari, to deliberately wish and enter into the body and subject Itself to sorrow?" .The answer is "Yes, if the Deity had desired ' I will enter in my unmodified form and I will experience sorrow'. But it is not so. As the Upanishad states expressly, the 'entry' is in the form of several jivas. A Jiva is merely a semblance (aabhaasamaatram) of the Deity. …It is like the reflection of a person seeming to have entered into a mirror and like the sun in water etc. The contact of the Deity with the intellect results in a semblance of consciousness (Jivah hi naama devataayaa aabhaasa-

maatram). ……The Deity does not Itself become connected with the human happiness, sorrow etc.….

4. BUB 3.4.2 – The atma is the witness of vision. Vision is of two kinds, worldly and paaramaartika. Worldly vision is a mode of the mind…… It arises as a reflection of the atma. It has a beginning and an end
5. In MUB 3.2.7, the atma consisting of knowledge identified with the intellect etc. entering the different bodies is talked about
6. In PS 125, Sankaracarya asks, "When one vessel (made of bell metal and the like in which the light of the sun is reflected is broken by chance, does the sun perish? Des the sun become a moving object on account of the moving nature of the reflected image?"
7. In BUB 2.4.12 and 2.4.13, (the commentary on the passage "na pretya samja asti"), in the dialogue between Maitreyi and Yajnavalkya, there is a clear distinction between the eternal, all pervading consciousness and the differentiated, individual consciousness (i.e., the objective consciousness). Yajnavalkya tells Maitreyi "In the one who is freed of the body-mind complex, there is no more the differentiated (i.e. individualized) consciousness such as 'I am the son of so and so; this is my land and wealth; I am happy; I am miserable, because it is engendered by Avidya. Since Avidya is absolutely destroyed by knowledge of Brahman where is the possibility of differentiated consciousness for the knower of Brahman who is established in his nature as Brahman? Even when the body is there the particular consciousness is not there; where is the possibility of its being there, when he is absolutely freed of the body mind complex?" In BUB 2.4.13, Maitreyi says, "By talking of opposite features in the same entity, Brahman, you have confused me." (Atra-eva ekasmin-eva ekasmin-vastuni brahmani viruddha-dharmarnatvam-acakshanena bhagavatah mama moha krtah….) Having said first that atma is homogenous (eternal) consciousness, then you say when the body dies, consciousness is no more there. How can it be homogeneous consciousness and after death cease to be consciousness? (Poorvam-vijaanaghana

eva-iti pratijnaaya punah na pretya samjna asti iti; katham vijnanaghana eva? katham va na pretya samjna asti it?). Yajnavalkya's significant reply is," I did not attribute them to the same entity. You have mistaken the same entity to have opposite attributes. (Na maya idam ekasmin dharmini abhihitam. Tvayaa eva idam viruddha-dharmatvena-ekam vastu parihgrhiitam bhrantyaa) What I said was this: When the differentiated forms of the atma associated with the body mind complex engendered by Avidya is destroyed by knowledge, the differentiated consciousness connected with the body mind complex characterized by a vision of otherness is destroyed when the upaadhi , the body mind complex is dissolved, like the destruction of the reflection of moon and the reflected light etc when their support, water etc. are destroyed. But there is no destruction of the transcendental Brahman, the homogenous consciousness , just as there is no destruction of the real moon etc. (Yasya-tu-avidya-prasrtyupaapitah-kaarya-karana-sambhandii-aatmanah-khilyabhaavah tasmin-vidyayaa nasite, tannimittaaa yaa viseshasamjnaa sariiraadi-sambhandinii- anyatva-darsana-lakshanaa, saa kaarya-karana-sanghaata-upadhou pravilapite nasyati hetu-abhaavaat udakadi-aadhaara-naasaad-iva candraadi-pratibimba- tvannimitta-ca-prakaasaadi. Na punah paramaartha-candraaditya-swaroopa-anaasavad-asamsaari-brahma-swaroopasya vijaanghnasya nasah)

8. US 18.32, 18.33 – The semblance of the face is different from the mirror because it behaves as the mirror does. The face which does not depend on the semblance of the face is different from the semblance in the mirror. Similarly the reflection of atma is held to be different from atma. The ego is also regarded like the reflection of the face which is different from the face. The pure Self is considered to be different from its reflection like the face. (Mukhaat-anyah mukha-aabhaasah yatha adarsah anukaaratah. Aabhaasaat-mukham-api-evam-aadarsa- ananuvartanaat. Ahamkrti-aatamani-bhaasah mukha-aabhaasavat-ishyate. Mukhavat-smrta aatma-anyah-avibktou tou tathaiva ca). In US 18.114, the semblance of consciousness in the intellect

is compared to the appearance of snake on the rope. US 18.37 - The reflection of the face (mukha aabhaasa) in the mirror is neither a property of the face nor of the mirror. If it were either, it would continue even if the other was removed. US 18.38 – It cannot be the property of the face, because it is not seen even when the face is there (and the mirror is removed). US 18.39 - It is not the property of both, because it is not seen when both are present (but improperly placed.) US 18.43 – The atma, Its reflection and the intellect are comparable to the face, its reflection and the mirror. The unreality of the reflection is known from the scriptures and reasoning. (Atma-aabhaasa-aasraya-ca-evam mukha-aabhasa-aasraya yatha. Gamyante sastra-yuktibhyaam-aabhaasa-asattvam-eva ca). US 18.114 – If you say that there will be changes in the intellect in case the reflection is accepted, we say 'No'. For we have already said that the reflection of Consciousness in the intellect is an unreality like a snake appearing to be a rope and like the reflection of the face in the mirror appearing to be the face itself. (Aabhaase parinamah cet na rajjvaadi-nibhatvavat. Sarpaadi-ca tatha-avocaama-aadarse ca mukhatvavat).US 120 – The ego which is pervaded by the reflection of the Consciousness (aabhaasena sampvyaaptah) is called the knower or the agent of knowing. One who knows oneself (the sakshi) to be different from all these three (the agent, the object and the instrument) is a (real) knower of the atma.

9. BSB 2.3.50 – It is to be understood that the jiva is only a semblance of Paramatma like the sun in water. The (empirical) Jiva is not the atma itself. (Aabhaasa eva ca esha jivah paramaatmanah jalasooryaadivat-pratipattavyah na sa eva saaakshaat). US 18.27 – On account of the constant proximity of the atma (the consciousness described in US 18.26 as self-effulgent, seer, the innermost, Existence, free from actions, directly cognized, the Self of all, Witness, One imparting consciousness to others, Eternal, devoid of qualities and non-dual) , the ego becomes its semblance (samnidhou sarvadaa tasya syat tat aabhaasah abhimaanakrt).

Section 2 - Sureswaracarya

1. Creation

1. Brahman is non-dual, eternal, and changeless and is neither cause nor effect. It is the cause of time. It has no parts. There is no material external to Brahman working on which Brahman can create anything. Brahman has no organs of perception and is devoid of intellect, desire and will. To talk of creation of the universe by Brahman of such a nature is illogical (TUBV II. 140, 142,143,144,375, BUBV Vol. 1.2.1.385,2.4.244, M II 54). The Sruti (Kathopanishad 1.2.14) which says that nothing originates from atma nor does the atma originate from anything negates (the idea that atma is the) cause etc. (BUBV Vol. 1 - 2.4.24).To imagine in Parameswara, in the One Self-luminous Existence, the relation of cause and effect is like imagining the head of Rahu. (M.VIII. 5-6).Plurality of forms is not tenable for Brahman which is without parts. (TUBV II 375).
2. Brahman, in Itself, is not the cause of the universe nor is It the inner controller (antaryaamin) or the witness of the world process. Without avidya, desire cannot arise. Brahman can be the cause of the universe only when Brahman is considered as having the upaadhi 'of ajnana (avidya, Maya). It is nama roopa that constitutes the limiting adjunct (upaadhii) ofParameaswara. (BUBV2.4.1O). Iswara is a semblance (aabhaasa) of Brahman¬consciousnes in Avidya also known as Maya (BUBV 3.7.43,44). Iswara, the semblance of Brahma caitanyam in Maya, is the cause of the universe, is the Inner Controller and is the witness of the world process. Iswara is omniscient (sarvajna) and omnipotent (sarv3saktimaan). Having deliberated, Iswara created the universe, taking into consideration the proper order, colour, previous karma of all beings (TUBV 373~. Iswara's creation of the universe is all a display of Maya. Ajnana is the material cause of the universe. From Maya, with Brahma caitanyam reflected in it (maayaam-pratibirnba- anusangatah) .. ..jivas come into being. Avidya with a semblance of

Brahma caitanyam (caitanya-aabhaasastha) is the cause of sthoola and sukshma sariras. Primary avidya (moola avidya) appears as the manifest and the unmanifest. (BUBV, 5 -1.4.1, I - 1.2.27, 1-12.26, TUBV II 373;377, IvIII 56, M II 32), Pranava-vartika 39.

3. The world which is composed of names and forms has no existence of its own. Brahman is existence. The existence in all phenomenal things proceed from the eternal Iswara. Everything has its being in the being of atma. The names and forms - ahamkaara and other objects - are superimposed on Bralunan. The gross and the subtle (vyaavahaarika satyam) and the illusory like the mirage (praatibhaasika satyam) have sprung from avidya. (TUBV II 407,408,416,417,418, M III 2,3, NS II 45). That is real which never attains another form different from that in which it has once been known. (NS iII.56). Since this universe along with the ego appears and disappears, it is false. (NS II. 95) It should be known through reasoning that the world of duality which is a false appearance, which has no reality of its own, which is caused by avidya and defies understanding, is different from atma (NS II. 44)
4. From the extracts given above, we can say that, according to Sureswacarya, the cause of the universe is not nirguna Brahman but Iswara, constituted by the semblance of Brahma caitanyam in Maya which is mithya. The reality is Brahman as existence. The mithya names and forms displayed by Maya are superimposed on Brahman, the reality, the existence. Iswara who is omniscient and omnipotent is the intelligent cause of creation.

2. Maya

1. Maya is designated as Pradhana, A vyakta, A vidya, Ajanana, Akshara, A vyakrta, Prakrti and . Tamas. C1'1 iI.31). The name 'Maya' is given to an appearance which cannot be accounted for ,Maya is a thing that defies understanding (avicaritasiddha) (BUVB 1.4.332,444; 2.3.224 NS sambandhokti 1.1.) It is not non-existent because it

appears; It is not existent because it is negated.(M. VIII.13). It is mithya. It is not different from Brahman inasmuch as it is located in Brahman. Nor is it. non-different from Brahman, because Brahman is non-dual and avidya is not a real entity. It is said to be notrnade of parts, because no parts caused it. It is not devoid of parts because its effects are made up of parts. (M.VIII. 15). (pranava-vartika 39-43). It is beginningless (anaadi) (in the sense that its beginning is not in time and it has no cause) (NS Introduction to Chapter I, M VIII 13, 15, Pranava-vartlka 39-43, BHBV Vol. 2¬4.3.5). Ajnaana is the material cause of (upadhaana kaaaranam) of the universe, the false appearance of duality (BUBV 1 -1.4371). \~'hatever exists is manifested by avidya. Sruti clearly says so, vide Swetasvatara Upanishad, " Understand that Prakriti is Maya and that Maheswara is the possessor of Maya. (BUBV vol. 1- 1..4.382). Avidya, though not really existing, appears as name and fomm (BUBV .1 - 1.2). Primary avidya (mooIa avidya) continuously appears in the fonn of the manifest and the unmanifest (BUBV 1 - 1.2.5.).

3. Locus and content of Maya

1. Any mithya has to have a real sub-stratum (adishtaanam). Not-Sdf (anaatma) is mithya. And it is a product of Maya. Cause is antecedent to effect. Therefore anatma cannot be the locus of Maya. Apart from anaatma, there is only Brahman and Brahman is satyam and, being eternal, It is not an effect. Therefore Brahman alone is the locus of Maya. (I1JBV II 64, Introduction to NS Third Chapter). . Brahman is also the content of Ajaanam(Avidya).
2. Anaatma cannot be the content of ignorance because it is a product of ignorance. What is a product cannot be the content of its cause. If anaatma was the content of ignorance, when ignorance is removed by knowledge, knowledge would be tantamount to knowledge of anaatma and not knowledge of atma.. Falsdy perceived silver is the product of shell. Silver is not the content of ignorance of shell. It is shell the ignorance

of which is removed when silver is negated. \Vhat is concealed from jiva is Brahman. For these reasons, Brahman alone is the content of Ajnaana. (paraphrase ofIntroduction to Chapter III ofNashkarmyasiddhi).

4. Debate about locus and content of Maya

6. ***Objection***: Brahman cannot be the locus of Maya (A vidya), because (a) Brahman is of the nature of knowledge, whereas A vidya is of the nature of ignorance and (b) Brahman is without a second.

   Answer: W'hen we talk of locus of Avidya, we are not referring to knowledge as the opposite of ignorance (pramaana jnaanam) but to consciousness which is Brahman's nature (swaroopa jnaanam). Swaroopa jnanam is not opposed to. ignorance. It is pramaana jnaanam that is opposed to ignorance. As for the second objection, A vidya is only a superimposition on Brahman; it is not a real entity. So the question of non-duality of Brahman being violated does not arise.

7. ***Objection***: Brahman cannot be the content of Avidya> because ignorance> like knowledge, is in someone and it is about something else. So, locus and content have to be different. If Brahman is the locus, the same Brahman cannot be the content. Since Brahman is partless, you cannot even say that one part of Brahman is the locus and another part is the content.

   Answer: Jnanottama, the commentator of Manasollasa, provides the answer. It is a matter of common experience for us to say« I know myself' and also" I do not know myself'. Thus, the content of knowledge or ignorance and the person who has it are the same entity. "I know myself" , as applied to anna, means that the existence and conscious aspect are known (- no one can deny that one exists and that one is a conscious being) and " I don't know myself' means that the non-duality and bliss aspects are not known. So the view that ajnaana is not only located in hut has Brahman as its content is tenable.

5. Jiva

(The distinction between the changing consciousness and the changeless conscxiousness is also discussed in this portion)

1. He, the Supreme Lord, the Magician, having created the universe through Maya, entered that very universe in the same way as a garland (1s said to enter) the illusory serpent> etc. (TOBV II 378). Brahman which is without differentiation is cognised in this (the intellect) which is thesource of all differentiation. Since in the luminous intellect we perceive Brahman as the seer, hearer and so on, due to illusion (mohaat) the entry by Brahman is imaginarily suggested by Sruti Hence, the entry of Brahman into the intellect is an imaginary representation. It is not conveyed in the literal sense. (rUBV II 397, 398).. The entry of one who by nature cannot have entered (into the universe) is stated in such a way as if it has entered with a view to teach the oneness of atma and Brahman by discarding the distinction between kshetrajna (sakshi) and Iswara,(TUBV401). The non-dual reality appears through avidya in the fonns of kshetranja (sakshi) and Iswara. (TUBV 530).
2. Plurality of fonns in the real sense is not valid for Brahman which is impartible, The pur;ility is an apparent plurality (I1JBV II 375). By removing avidya, we must realise the oneness of kshetranga and Iswara. The non-dual Seer (atma) appears as many in several bodies, because of the presence of the antahkarana.
3. Just as a rope appears in the fonn of a snake through avidya, though it is not really competento become that, so also, atrna appears as the jiva consisting of the five sheaths (pancakosas) and suffers, as, it were, in the form of jiva (TOBV II 250). The distinction
between jivatrna and paramatrna is caused by the upaadhi of the body. (M III.9).
4. The "J" does not exist without the atma; Without the atma, it will cease to be. (The "I" cannot exist on its own. It is mithya; \vithout its sub-stratum, it will cease to be (NS II

56).If, in the objective consciousness, the thinker were not to manifest himself as "I" the whole world be like one asleep. (1'.1. IV 2). If the insentient objects were to shine by themselves, everything would present itself to everyone's consciousness. (M IV 4-5). If the sentient and the insentient be alike self-luminous, each will perceive and, in turn, be perceived by the other and so on.. And the sense organs, being unrestricted in their scope of perception, taste would be known by the eye and so on. (M IV 5-6).

5. Ignorance of atma on the part of jiva is the root cause of suffering. Ignorance conceals bliss which is the nature of atma, (Introduction to N.S. Chapter I).Though the Inner Self (pratyagatrna) whose light ever shines and never sets is the ,vitness of a'\;.dya, it is nevertheless obstructed by avidya, (rUBV II 438). Just as the mirror is dimmed by a stain attaching to it, so consciousness is veiled by avidya and, thereby creatures are deluded. (Ajnaanena-aavrtam jnaanamtenamuhyantijantavah).(M. III. 8). Maya is responsible for non-apprehension (agrahana or ajaaana), misapprehension (anyathaa jnaana or vipariitajnaana) and doubtfuJ cognition (samsayajnaana). Misapprehension is the result of non-apprehension. (BUVB 1.4..)
6. Like a rope becoming a serpent through avidya, separating himself from the non-dual¬Brahma caitanyarn, through avidya,jiva makes himself an agent and enjoyer. (TIJBV II 463). The text "When there is duality, as it were. . . .one knows something" (Brhadaranyaka 2.4.14) etc,.have conveyed to us that the notion of duality (dwaya-aabhaasam) in the form of enjoyment and enjoyershiop is caused byavidya. (TIJBV III. 68). Owing to the conceit (abhimaana) " I am the knower", the jiva, indeed, performs the acts of cognition. Again, on account of the delusion" I ani the thinker", he does all mental activities". (TUBV II 225).
7. By ignorance, attributes of the insentient, unreal and the finite body are ascribed to the conscious atma and the reality, consciousness and bliss of atma are ascribed to the body, just as the mother of pearl is mistaken for silver which is quite a different thing.. (M VII 21-22). The following is said with a view to showing how, owing to avidya, there

is mutual

superimposition between the atrma which is self-established (swata-siddhah) and the not-self (anaatma) which is established by another (parata-siddhah) , in the same way as there is mutual superimposition between the empirical rope and the (illusory) snake:-:

Just as the movement of clouds is superimposed on the moon, even so the qualities of the intellect such as pleasure are thought of as in the atma. (NS 101). Just as an ignorant man ascribes the burning nature of the fire to the (red-hot) iron, even so consciousness which belongs to the atma is ascribed to the agent (i.e. the internal organ - antahkarana) due to delusion. (NS II 102) All this false appearance (aabhaasa) is due to delusion (avidya) (moha¬maatra-upaadhaanatvaat). (NS 51). All our mundane experience iis a display of Maya (M.VIII.12).

8. The ego-consciousness, the feeling of mineness (aham-mamatvam) and desire are not the attributes of atma, for they are experienced as objective and and they are subject to cessation NSII 22).
9. Without change there can be no sufferer. How can that which changes be the witness (of the changes)? Therefore, the atma is the unchanging witness to the thousand modifications of the mind (NS II 77).to. The mind cognises objects by fragments. If it does not change in this manner, it will be omniscient like the atma (NS n. 87).
10. The atma is the witness to the momentary modifications of the mind. Indeed in the absence of the immutable consciousness, the appearance and disappearance of the mind cannot be established. (NS II 82)
11. The intellect which contains the semblance of atma caitanyam is the agent (karta); atma is not the agent, because It is immutable. (Atmacaitanyaroopa dhii kartru na dhruvavtatah) (TUBV II 308). The agency of the unchanging atma is an illusion, in the same way as the ascription of motion to the trees is an illusion due to the movement of the boat (NS II 63)

12. The body, the senses, the mind and the determinative modes of the intellect are rejected as not-Self, because they are perceived and are subject to origination and cessation The internal organ (antahkarana) which has the 'I' notion also is perceived and appears and disappears; it is also, therefore, not-Self (anaatma) (NS II 82).
13. The intellect which contains the semblance of atma caitanyam is the agent (karta); atma is not the agent, because it is immutable (NS II 63). If the 'I' notion was an attribute of the atma, it would be eternal, like the atma; that is, it will continue during sushupti and even in
    the state of liberation.
14. Knowledge and ignorance which inhere in the mind are cognised. Therefore neither is the attribute of the atma; they belong to the sphere of name and form (fUBV II 578).
    16. Brahman, in Itself, is not the individual cogniser (pramaata) or agent (karta), or enjoyer (bhokta). These are characteristics of the jiva, constituted by the semblance of consciomsnes in the intellect. (BUVB. 5 (1) 4 (1).
15. If the ego is an attribute of anna, it would be eternal, like consciosness (Braluna-caitanyam) and continue, not only in deep sleep, but in liberation and scriptural texts which speak of liberation (from duality) will certainly become futile. Since it does not continue, the ego must belong to something else (ie. the mind - NS II.32, 33).
16. The object of being burnt and the agency that bums co-exist in the fire and the fuel. In the same way, the property of being the knower and that of being the object known coexist in the knlower ands the ego (NS III 59).
17. One who wakes up from deep sleep says, "I did not know anything in sleep". Here, the term, "I", signifies the Paramatma, as the ego is suspended in sleep. (NS II 54).
18. Viewing the atma as conditioned by the agency of the adjuncts (upaadhis) such as the intellect which are caused by ajnaanam, it was said, on the basis of anvaya-vyatireka that the notions of "1 am happy", "1 am miserable" etc. of the ego are the qualities of the not-sdf (anaatma). If it is accepted that the atma is unconditioned, It cannot be

involved in any experience, for it is not fit enough for that; nor can any &uit accrue to It. Now, by presupposing the witness-nature (saakshitvam) of the atma which is a pmjection of avidya, the following is said with a view to denying (of the atma) all kinds of transformation such as agency:-

There is no such thing as the act of illumination. The approach of the object to be illumined within its range is figurativdy spoken of as the act of illumination on the part of the atma.

(NS II. 68).

19. Question: If the atma in all bodies is one, would not a person who has realised the atma not experience the sufferings of all ? Answer: Even prior to gaining knowledge of our real nature as atma, the suffering in other bodies does not affect us. How can it affect a person who has disidentified ...vith the suffering of his own body? (NS II 90).
20. Jiva is it semblance ofBrahma caitanyam (cit-aabhaasa) in the intellect. An aabhaasa is different from the original but is resembles the original (cidvilakshanatve sati cidvat¬bhaasamaanatvam cidaabhaasatvam) (BlJBV 4.3.1320).
    1. Nescience (avidya) blended with a semblance of atrna caitanyam is the cause of sthoola and suksma swas (Caitanya-aabhaasaswacittamm sariiradwaya-kaaranam). (pranava-vartika 39)
    2. The mind has the power of cognizing owing to the influence of that unchanging consciousness (NS III.IS). The atma which does not see... .does not change.. ..does not hate, does not get angry, does notsuffer, does not enjoy ..is unmoving, is timeless, immutable, is relative, id the inner undivided Reality and is infinite perceives in all bodies the mind which sees, hears, desires,hates, gets angry, suffers, enjoys, . .is subject to time, past, present and future, perishes every moment, is relative... ..and is finite (NS II 71-75).

A radiant jewel remains changelessly the same, whether (it is illuminimg) an object like pot when it is in its proximity and (it is not illumining) when the pot is not its proximity (NS II 64, 65). In the same way, the supreme Self (paramatma) which is of the nature of illumination, remains immutable in the presence as well as in the absence of the modifications of the intellect (NS II 66). The unchanging I is the wi?1ess of the thousand modifications of the mind (NS II

21. This seer of inextinguishable and undivided awareness witnesses the insentient dance of the operations of all the minds, though in reality there is no such thing as the act of witnessing on his part (NS II 58).

    A radiant jewel remains changelessly the same, whether it is illumining an object like the pot when it is its proximity or not illumining it when it is not in is proximity. Like that, Paramatma, remaining immutable in the presence as well as the absence of the modifications of the intellect reveals (illumines) the intellect. (NS II 66). In the atma, there is no such thing
22. Talking of jiva, Sureswacarya uses all the three terms - 'aabhaasa', 'pratibitnba' and 'conditioning of Brahma caitanyam' - while defining jiva as, seen from the extracts given

    below
    1. Like unto a clear mirror, the intellect (buddhi) because of its predominance of sattva in it and in virtue of the reflecction of atma in it receives images of external objects. (1-'lanasollasa

       IV.8,9).
    2. Jiva is a semblance ofBrahma caitanyam (cit-aabhaasa) in the intellect. An aabhaasa is different from the original but is resembles the original (cidvilakshanatve sati cidvat-bhaasamaanatvam cidaabhaasatvam) (BUBV 4.3.1320).

3. The non-dual Seer (atma) appears to be many in several bodies, because of the presence of the internal organ (antahkarana), just as the sun appears to be many in different water vessels (NS II 47).
4. As the space within a jar is marked off from the infinite space by the upaadhi of the jar, so is the distinction between jivatma and Paramatma caused by the upaadhi of the body (M III 9).
5. Manifesting Himself by way of reflection (pratibimbe sphuran) in the kriya-sakti and jnaanasaktii, in the antahkarana, the Lord (Iisah) is spoken of as the doer and knower. (M IV
7-8).

23. However, the extracts given below indicate that the preferance ofSureswaracarya is, like Sankaracarya's, is aabhaasa vaada:, which in essence is the positing of a secondary consciousness, which functions along with the mind and is of a lower order of reality than Paramatma, the eternal uncchanging consciousness. We have ti infer this since the teaching is a combination. of a sakshi being aware of the modifications of the mind and the absence of any such thing as the act of illumination on the part of the atma as the act of illumination. The approach of the object to be illumined within its range of illumination is figuratively spoken of as the act of illumination (NS 67).

Section 3 - Vidyaranya

1. Creation. Jiva

(The numbers in brackets are references to Vidyaranya's Pancadasi)

1. According to Vidyaranya, it is not the paaramaartika nirguna Brahman (the absolute Brahman devoid of attributes) who is the creator of the universe but it

is a vyaavahaarika mithya saguna Iswara (an empirical mithya entity, with attributes, called Iswara) who is the creator. Citing Tu .1 and 1.4 (satyam jnaanam anantam brahma and yato vaco nivartante apraapya manasaa sahaa) to establish the transcendental nature (asangatvam) of Brahman and another sruti " Controlling Maya, the master of Maya , creates the universe through Maya " (maayii srjati visvam as Mayii srjati visvam sanniruddha tatra mayayaa.......tena iiswara srjet), he says that if you analyse Sruti passages applying the six fold criteria (shadlinga like upakrama and upasamhaara), you will come to know that it is not the transcendental (asanga) Brahman but Maheswara, the master of Maya (Maayaavi Maheswarah) who creates the universe (6.195, 196,197).

2. Vidyaranya talks of Prakriti as an entity which has the three qualities (gunas), satva (the quality of knowledge, purity and goodness), rajas (the quality of activity and passion) and tamas (the quality of darkness, ignorance, illusion and error) and which is equipped with a reflection of Brahman. Prakriti has three varieties, one, suddha satva (satva predominant variety) called Maya, visuddhi satva guna or malina satva (rajas tamas predominant variety) called Avidya and three, tamas predominant variety, called Tamas. Maya with the reflection of Brahman-Bliss-consciousness (cidaanandamayabrahma) becomes the omniscient, blissful Iswara, the (sarvajna aanandamaya iiswara). Maya is under Iswara's control. The intellect, dominated by Avidya, with the reflection of Brahman-consciousness (Brahma caitanyam) becomes the jiva, the knower-consciousness (vijaanamaya jiva). Owing to gradations of Avidya, jivas are of different species (1.15, 16,17,4.11, 6.157, and 6.212). Vidyaranya compares, respectively, the all pervading Brahman, Maya, Iswara, atma (called kootastha), the all pervading consciousness available in the individual and the jiva to the all pervading space, the cloud, the space reflected in the water in the cloud, the

space in the pot and the space reflected in the water in the pot. Maya is compared to the cloud. (6-18).

3. Iswara visualises creation according to the requirement of the karma of jivas, and, directed by Iswara, Tamas modifies from seed form and produces names and forms (nama roopa) consisting of the five elements , the subtle bodies of jivas (sukshma sarira) with the five organs of knowledge (jnaanendriyas), the five organs of action (karmendriyas), the fivefold vital airs (praana), and the antahkarana comprising the manas and buddhi (roughly, the deliberation and decision aspects of the mind and intellect), the physical body of jivas (sthoola sarira), the various worlds and objects of the universe (jagat). This creation flowing from Iswara consists in Maya unfolding the unmanifest nama roopa (avyaakrta nama roopa), and superimposing the manifest nama roopa (vyaakrta nama roopa) on Brahman the Existence , like a picture of variegated colours being painted on a wall or like imagined things such as wondrous cities (gandharvanagara), blueness and dome-like shape being superimposed on space. Not only nama roopa like the five elements and their products, but space and time are also superimposed by Maya. The folding and unfolding of nama roopa by Maya, (aavirbhaavam, srshti) and the alternating dissolution (viliinam, pralaya), controlled by Iswara, is like a painter exposing the painting he has executed on a canvas and then folding it up. (1.16 to 26,2.59, 2. 60 et seq., 3.36, 4.6 to 8, 123 to 125, 6.131, 183).The non-dual Brahman (advaitam) alone is real. The dwaitam (the nama roopa superimposed by Maya on Brahman, the Existence) is unreal. (6.155, 156)… Similarly, cidaabhaasa with the physical and subtle body is a superimposition (adhyaasa) on kootastha, like the silver seen on shell. (6.33). Negation (baadha) consists in the determination of the mithya nature (mithyaatvam) of jagat and jiva (i.e. the antahkarana cidaabhaasa mixture) and the reality (satyatvam) of Paramatma. (6.12, 13, 14).

4. Vidyaranya says that Maya's nature is that it can do the impossible; it makes the non-existent appear as existent. It makes the changeless transcendental atma (kootastha asanga atma) (Brahman) appear as Iswara jiva and jagat. The phenomenon is like the mithya dream world appearing to be real to the one who dreams. The phenomenon of the animate and the inanimate universe like Iswara, jiva etc. appearing on the non-dual Brahman (advidiiya brahmatattve) Iswara, jiva and jagat has no more reality than the mithya dream is to the person who has woken up(2-70, 6-133, 134, 211,). Considering the in determinability of Maya, learned people declare Maya to be just magic. (6.143). Pursuing this line of thought, Vidyaranya says that the aanandamaya Iswara and the vijaanamaya jiva are conjured up (kalpitou) by Maya and, in turn, Iswara conjures up the creation, visualising and entering it and jiva conjures up, until liberation, samsaara in waking and dream states (6.112,113).
5. Vidyaranya talks of Maya as the power of Brahman (Brahma-sakti) (2-47) and as resting on Brahman (brahma-aasraya) (2-59). However, he clarifies that it is different from Brahman (which is the non-dual existence), has no existence of its own (so said to be unreal – nistattva). It derives existence only from its association with Brahman. It cannot be said to be absolutely non-existent because the nama roopa, the products from which it is inferred, are experienced by us. (2.47 to 2.51). Thus, from the point of view of sruti) i.e., from the paaramaartika standpoint, Maya is non-existent. If you go by reasoning, it is anirvacaniiya i.e. you can neither say that it is existent nor can you say that it is non-existent. From the vyaavahaarika point view it exists, since its products are perceived (tucca anirvacaniiyaa ca vaastavii cet asou tridha; jneyaa maayaa tribhirbodhaiih sroutayouktikaloukikaih) (6-130). Since Maya does not have independent existence, like non-existence, it is not counted as a second entity, apart from the non-dual Brahman (2.51)

6. Maya called Maheswari on account of its association with the great God (Maheswara) has a two fold power¸ the power of projection (nirmaana sakti, vikshepa sakti) and the power of veiling (moha sakti, aavarana sakti). (4.12, 6-26).). Jiva is a mixture of the adhishtaanam, the Brahma caitanyam, the sukshma-sarira and the reflection of consciousness in it (4-11). Deluded by the aavarana sakti of Maya, jiva becomes ignorant of his true nature as Brahman (ignorant of 'aham brahma asmi'). By its vikshepa sakti, Maya makes the jiva identify with his bodies, the physical and the subtle (sthoola and sukshma), deprived of the awareness of the transcendental asanga kootastha, pratyagaatma (Jiva's own consciousness, which is the same as Brahman-consciousness, Brahma caitanyam) (like the adhyaasa of taking the shell to be silver), react with external objects and other jivas (paragdarsinah), regarding himself as different from all and is involved in a chain of action, enjoyment and suffering and transmigration (which is called samsaara) (1-25, 29,30; 6.23, 24,25, 26, 27, 6-33, 34 6,36, 6-134). Iswara's creation is related to the karma of all jivas taken together. Iswara-srshti, the universe of objects created by Iswara is the same for all. But jiva-srshti the mental reaction to them, likes and dislikes of and the attitude to other beings and things and the consequent action, enjoyment and suffering vary from individual to individual, based on that Jiva's past karma and upaasana and his vaasana, the imprint of experience of past janmas and exercise of free will in the current janma. It is not Iswara srshti but jiva srshti that is the cause of man's bondage. Vidyaranya cites Brhadaranyaka Upanishad saptaanna braahmana - the past karma and upaasana is four-fold sacrifices and offerings (action and thought towards ancestors, gods, other human beings and other jivas like plants, animals, insects etc.;) this becomes the karma of jivas consisting of punyam or paapam as, the case may be, depending on the good or bad action, thought and attitude; the bhogyam of

karmaphalam, the experience of happiness and sorrow in return for the past karma, is through the particular medium with which one is , in the form of the mind (manah), vital force (praana) and speech (vaak), equipped with, in the current janma. (4.13 to 35).

7. Dealing with the question as to how Avidya and its aavarana sakti can appear on kootastha which is self-effulgent (swaprakaasa) Vidyaranya says that Kootastha caitanyam is not inconsistent with Avidya and its aavarana sakti. If caitanyam and Avidya were opposed, who would be subject to the aavarana sakti (of Avidya)? As we see in the jnaani, it is the discriminative knowledge (viveka), knowledge of Brahman that is opposed to Avidya. (6.28,31,32.). [The idea is that, without kootastha caitanyam which is only another name for Brahma caitanyam which is the adhishtaanam(6.237), the mithya Maya and its aavarana sakti cannot exist. Without kootastha caitanyam, there is no cidaabhaasa. Just as the aavarana sakti and vikshepa sakti of Maya are responsible for Jiva's ignorance of Brahmatvam and his samsaara, it is Jiva's antahkarana with cidaabhaasa that is responsible for jiva coming to know (through Sastra) Maya and its powers and negating Maya as mithya. In short, whereas kootastha and Maya are not opposed, knowledge of kootastha and Maya are opposed.) Dwaitam (which, as a technical term refers to the universe of nama roopa) being the product of the mithya Maya is not opposed to advaitam (Brahman) (6.245, 246), because dwaitam is unreal and advaitam is real. Entities of different orders of reality can co-exist. A bachelor can go to sleep and have a dream that he has a wife and has a number of children and grandchildren.]
8. Iswara is the antaryaami (Inner Controller) in jivas. From this, one may think that the actions and thoughts are controlled by Iswara, (whose control is in accordance with the praarabdha of jivas) and that jivas have no free will.

Vidyaranya says that, by the grace of Iswara, Jivas do have free will and it is by free will that they gain the knowledge of their identity with atma and attain moksha (6.157, 171,177,178,179,183)

Section 4 - Vacaspati Misra - Avacceda vaada - Bhamati Sampradaaya

1. Creation

1. Following Sankaracarya and Sureswaracarya, Vacaspati Misra rules out nirguna Brahman being the material cause actually transforming as the universe, since Brahman, according to sruti, is non-dual and immutable. He says that if the universe was an actual transformation of Brahman, (Brahman being consciousness) all objects of the universe -not merely jivas - would be sentient. So, Brahman is only an apparent material cause (vivarta upaadhaana kaaranam). He makes a distinction between unconditioned Brahman (nirupaadhika Brahman) and conditioned Brahman (sopaadhika Brahman). Owing to the upaadhi of avidya (Maya), Brahman acquires the attributes of omniscience and omnipotence. . (Sat eva muktah sat eva kevalah; anaadi avidya-vasaa-tu bhrantyaa tathaa avabhaasata iti arthah. Tat eva anoupaadhikam roopam darsayitva avidya-upaadhikam roopam aaha – sarvajnam sarvasakti-samanvitam (B on BSB 1.1.1). This sopaadhika Brahman called Iswara is the material and intelligent cause of the universe. Maya is the upaadhi of Iswara and the intellects are the upaadhis of jivas. Maya is beginningless and indefinable (anirvacaniiya).
2. Vacaspati Misra talks of the indeterminability of the universe (anirvacaniiyatvam) giving the analogy of the mirage. Is the cognition of water appearing in the rays of the sun reflected from the desert sand real or not? If it

was real, it would not be negated. But we do negate it, when we reach the spot where we perceived it and find that there is no water. At the same time we cannot absolutely deny the existence of the water, because water was cognized. The experience of the perception of water, qua experience, cannot be negated. Thus, the mirage is neither existent nor non-existent nor existent-cum-non-existent. Similarly, the universe of objects, bodies and organs are also, indescribable as existent or non-existent. Brahman's absoluteness (paaramaartika satyam) is proved by scripture and reasoning. The objects, bodies, sense organs and intellects (antahkarana) of the universe are superimposed on Brahman owing to Avidya. The sub-stratum of this superimposed mithya world is Brahman, just as the rope is the sub-stratum of the erroneously perceived snake. . Avidya, in the form of superimposition, is indeterminable (Mithya-pratyaya-roopah mithya-pratyayaaanam roopam anirvacaniiyatvam; tadyasya sa tadokthah anirvacaniiya ityarthah.)

2. Jiva

1. Jiva is not different from Atma (Brahman) or nor is jiva a modification of Brahman. Jiva is Brahma caitanyam itself appearing to be limited owing to the influence of avidya (Na jiva aatmanah anyah. Na api tat vikaarah. Kintu atma eva avidya upaadhaana kalpita avaccedah) (B on BSB 1.4.22.) Avidya operates at the empirical (vyaavahaarika plane), through its dual power of concealment (aavarana) and projection (vikshepa). Jivas are at the mercy of the concealing and projecting powers of Avidya. Iswara, being its Lord is not affected by avidya. . The concealing power of avidya gives rise to the non-apprehension of the identity of jivas with Brahman. The consciousness in the body mind complex is wrongly apprehended as finite just as space (apparently) enclosed in pots etc is apprehended as the limited space. Brahman is homogenous,

undifferentiated consciousness, but, owing to the qualities superimposed by avidya, It appears as differentiated objectifying intellects and as numerous limited individuals.

3. Avidya – Content and locus

1. Like other Advaita philosophers, Vacaspati Misra also says that the content of avidya is Brahman It is due to the influence of avidya that jivas, forgetting the identity of Brahma caitanyam and pratyagaatma, regard the enclosed pratyagatma to be a limited individual knower-consciousness and themselves to be limited individuals.
2. As regards locus of avidya Vacaspati Misra holds that Jiva is the locus of moola avidya. His argument is that it is only the jiva who is the agent (karta), the enjoyer (bhokta), the one who has the notion of "I" (ahamkaara-aaspada), the transmigrator (samsaari) and the victim of all suffering (sarva-anartha-bhaajanam). Therefore jiva alone can be the locus of the avidya which is the root cause of all these. On the other hand, Brahman is pure (suddha), defect less (niranjana) and is of the nature of knowledge (vidyaatma). Therefore it is illogical to speak of Brahman as the locus of avidya. Further, it is the jiva, not Brahman, who requires the saving knowledge for removing avidya. Logically, the destroyer, vidya and the destroyed, avidya, must have the same locus.
3. According to Vacaspati Misra, avidya is not one. there are as many avidyas as there are jivas. If avidya was a single entity, then when one jiva attains the knowledge 'I am Brahman' (aham brahmaasmi jnaanam), the single avidya will be removed and, there being no avidya to delude other jivas, all jivas will be simultaneously liberated, without any effort on their part. He explains the use of "Maya" in singular in Su 4.10 by interpreting it as the state of being deluded by avidya (avidyaatva).

4. The objection raised against this is "If avidya which is the cause of jivas and is responsible for hiding their Brahmatvam from jivas is located in the jivas, there arises the defect of mutual dependence (anyonya asraya). What is a product of avidya cannot be its locus. Vacaspati Misra's answer is "there is a succession of janmas; my present janma is due to the ignorance located in me in my previous janma and the ignorance located in me in the present janma will produce my next janma; thus, there are two beginningless series, one of janmas and the other of ignorance. So there is no defect of anyonya asraya."

Section 5 - Prakasatman – Pratibimbavaada - Vivarana Sampradaaya

1. Creation

1. Prakasatman cites Tu 31.1., 2.7.1 and Cu 6.2.3 which talk of Brahman as the material and intelligent cause of the universe and goes on to point out the difficulties in regarding nirupaadhiika Brahman as the transformative material cause or the intelligent cause. Brahman can be the material cause only if It undergoes modification into the form of the world, leaving its earlier form. Even if it is argued that, after undergoing modification into the form of the world, Brahman would regain its earlier form, since it will retain its susceptibility to modification, we have to face the unwelcome prospect of liberated jivas returning to bondage again. But we have the Upanishadic text, "The atma (Brahman) is birthless, all pervasive and immutable" (Bu 4.4.20). Immutability and modification cannot be the nature of the same entity. It follows that nirupaadhika Brahman cannot be the material cause of the universe (V. p. 464). As regards, Brahman being the intelligent cause, only an entity with a thinking mind which can visualize and design the universe can be

the intelligent cause. But this process is not possible in the case of Brahman which Sastra says is of the nature of consciousness devoid of instruments of visualisation and action (Bu 3.8.8. etc.). Therefore nirupaadhika Brahman cannot be the intelligent cause of the universe, either. Therefore, Prakasatman says that Sruti and Smriti texts introduce the principle of Maya. He cites, inter alias, Su 4.10, "Know that Prakriti is Maya and the wielder of Maya is the great Lord" and says that Brahman, the pure consciousness, associated with Maya, should be regarded as the material cause of the universe.

2. The pure consciousness is reflected in avidya and thus, jivas are formed. As the prototype of the reflection (pratibimba), pure consciousness acquires an adventitious status as its original (bimba). This is called Iswara. Maya functions at the behest of Iswara. Iswara, as bimba caitanyam, is omniscient. Thus Iswara and Maya taken together, is the material and intelligent cause of the universe. Maya is the transformative material cause (parinaami upaadhaana kaaranam), but Brahman as existence, being the sub-stratum of Maya, is figuratively said to be the material cause (is the vivarta upaadhaana kaaranam). Maya is Iswara's mind; thus pure consciousness associated with Maya gets the empirical (vyaavahaarika) status of the omniscient (sarvajna) Iswara with the knowledge and desire required for creation. While the material of the world is transformed Maya, Iswara visualizes and designs the universe and guides Maya. The appearance of the word upon Brahman is mithya. Prakasatman defines mithya as "the state of being the counterpositive (pratiyogin) of the absence of an entity at all three periods of time in a sub-stratum where it is perceived to exist

2. Jiva

1. Avidya (Maya) is one, vide Swesvatara Upanishad 4.10, “Know Maya to be Prakriti (the material cause of the universe) and the Lord (Maayii) to be its controller or possessor, where the word, Maya, is used in the singular. Avidya (Maya) is a single entity, but the reflection of consciousness in avidya results in a plurality of jivas; the main feature of jiva is the intellect; since the intellects projected by avidya are many, jivas with intellects carrying the apparent reflection of consciousness are many.
2. According to Prakasatman, the pratibimba caitanyam is identical with Brahma caitanyam. If that were not so, the mahavakyas revealing identity of jivatma and paramatma like “Thou art That “where the words are in aikyasamaanaadhikaranyam, will become meaningless. Though that is a fact, owing to the veiling power (aavarana sakti) of Maya (Avidya) jivas mistake the consciousness o be different from Brahma caitanyam and, consequently regard themselves as limited individuals and undergo samsaara.
3. Philosophers like Vacaspati Misra preclude the very possibility of reflection. But this is refuted by citing the example of mahaakaasa which does not have form being reflected in the water of a pond and sound reflected as echo in the space in a cave, which does not have as form.
4. The thesis that reflection is identical with the original is beset with problems. The example of mirror is taken. It is argued that (a) one does not perceive one’s eyeballs in one’s face on the neck but one perceives it in the reflection (b) the location is different; one’s face is on one’s neck; the reflection is in the mirror (c) the reflection appears in front of the man facing the mirror and (d) a person standing by the side of the man facing the mirror cognizes the face of that man and the reflection in the mirror as two different entities. This is refuted by saying that when the sense of sight comes into contact with the mirror, the rays of light proceeding from the face of the person standing before the mirror are

turned back by the mirror, then reach the original face and comprehend all parts of it fully. On the original face comprehended fully, the other characteristics mentioned by the opponents constituting the state of reflection (pratibimbatva) (namely presence of the reflected face inside the mirror, reflection facing the original and the difference between the original and the reflection) are superimposed. If there was no mirror, there would be no such superimposition. That is to say, the appearance of the one face being an original and a reflection (bimbatva and pratibimbatva) is a false notion (adhyaasa. This amounts to saying that when a person thinks that he is seeing a reflection of his face in the mirror, what he actually perceives is the face on his neck. (This also seems to accord with science. According to science also, when the rays of light carrying the image of the face of the person standing in front of the mirror falls on the surface of the mirror, they do not enter the mirror; they are turned back and fall on the eyes of the person standing in front of the mirror. The perception of the face as being inside the mirror is an optical illusion.) In the same way, caitanya pratibimbatva and caitanya bimbatva are superimposed on Brahma caitanyam, due to avidya. These two features are indeterminable as they are caused by avidya. But Brahman per se, whether it is as the consciousness of Iswara or the consciousness of jivas, is real and the same. The superimposition of bimbatva leads to the false notion (adhyaasa) of jivas that they are limited individuals. The adhyaasa which is caused by avidya is removed by the knowledge of the identity of the jiva with Brahman.

5. If avidya is said to be one, one has to meet the objection that when any one jiva overcomes the aavarana sakti of avidya by gaining the knowledge, “I am Brahman”, and gets liberation avidya be destroyed altogether and all other jivas will get liberated, simultaneously, without any effort on their part. (The distinction between any one jiva getting liberated and other In Siddhanta-lesa-

sangraha, Appayya Dikshita explains that it is quite possible to account for the distinction between the liberation of one jiva and the bondage of others since we accept that Maya is an indeterminable (anirvacaniiya) entity. An anirvacaniiya entity, single entity can have anirvacaniiya parts. It is one anirvacaniiya part of avidya alone that gets removed by one jiva attaining ahambrahmasmi knowledge; other anirvacaniiya parts continue to influence the minds of other jivas holding them in bondage.)

3. Content and locus of avidya

1. Like all other Advaita philosophers, Prakasatman holds that Brahman is the content (vishaya) of avidya
2. According to Prakasatman, Brahman is the locus of avidya. Jiva cannot be said to be the locus of avidya. Jiva is dormant, in the causal state (kaarana avastha). There is no Jiva to say "I do not know anything." Only consciousness and avidya are there, It is true that jiva recollects, on waking, "I slept happily; I did not know anything" but he also says "I was absent in sushupti". What he recollects is the bliss of pure consciousness and the ignorance of avidya. Jiva's intellect is a reflecting medium. A reflecting medium appropriates the property of the original as its own, just as the mirror appropriates the face.
3. Is avidya also the cause of the praatibhaasika adhyaasa perception of silver in shell? If so, the adhyaasa will be removed only by knowledge of Brahman. Prakasatman says that as derivatives of the primal avidya (moola avidya), there are modal ignorances (toola avidyas or avastha ajnaanams). While the content of moola avidya is Brahman, the content of a toola avidya is the consciousness conditioned by an object. Thus, perception of silver on shell is one of the toola avidyas concealing the caitanyam conditioned by the shell. When this toola

avidya is removed, by the shell vritti, this toola avidya is removed and perception of silver ceases.

4. Conclusion

From all this, we can arrive at the common ground in the teaching of all the Advaita preceptors mentioned above.

1. Brahman is not the actual material cause of creation. It is the tranfigurative material cause (vivarta upaadhaana kaaranam). It is the adhishtaanam (sub-stratum), as Existence-Consciousness–Existence which is the essence of the objects of the world – the nama roopa - and the source of the consciousness of living beings.
2. Avidya (Maya) is the transformative material cause (parinaami upaadhaana kaaranam). It superimposes the names and forms on the adhishtaanam. Brahman associated with Avidya is the intelligent cause of creation.

   The world of solid objects that we experience is mithya. It is an appearance like the snake perceived on the rope.

   Brahman, Existence- Consciousness-Infinity which is non-dual, formless and attributeless is the only reality.
3. The notion of jivas that they are different from Brahman and are doers (karta and bhokta) and knowers (pramatas) is adhyasa, an erroneous notion caused by avidya.
4. Avidya has the power of concealing Jivas' nature as Brahman (aavaraNa sakti) and not only projects the world of nama roopa but deludes jivas so that they identify themselves with their body and knower-mind and undergo samsaara.

5. Whether jivas are said to have a secondary, unreal consciousness, in addition to a Brahma caitanyam (abhasa vaada) or the Brahma caitanyam available in the intellect is itself mistaken to be a reflection confined to the individual intellect (pratibimba vaada) or the consciousness appearing to be enclosed in the intellect is mistaken to be a consciousness confined to the intellect (avacceda vaada), in all the cases, there is the false notion (adhyaasa) on the part of jivas that they are limited individuals different from Brahman.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Advaita Ashrama (Kolkata) publications of Swami Gambhirananda's translations in English of Sankaracarya's Bhashyas of Brahma Sutra, the Eight Upanishads (2 volumes), Brhadaranyaka Upanishad and Chandogya Upanishad.
2. Publications of Chinmaya Mission and Central Chinmaya Mission Trust Translations in English by Swami Chinamayananda of Sankaracarya's Tattyvabodha, Atmabodha, and of Kaivalya Upanishad.
3. Mylapore, Chennai, Ramakrishna Mutt publication of Translation in English of Sankaracarya's Upadesa Sahasri.
4. Chennai Samata Books publication of Translation in English by Alladi Mahadeva Sastry of Sureswaracarya's Manasollasa and Pranava vartika.
5. The following chapters in Madras University Philosophical Series Volume II Part 2:- (First Published in 2000 by Professor Bhuvan Chandel, Member Secretary, Centre for Strides in Civilisation, Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi)
    - Post-Sankara Advaita – the Vivarana tradition by N.eezhinathan
    - Post-Sankara Advaita – The Bhamati Tradition by N.Sankaranarayanan.
6. Madras University Philosophical Series
   Translation in English by R. Balasubramanian of Sureswaracarya's Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya vartrikam and Naishykarmyasiddhi
7. Vivekacudamani with Siddinathananda Swami's commentary, in Malayalam, published by Sri Ramakrishna Asram, Puranaattukara, Trichur.

8. Swetaswatara Upanishad with Mrdananda Swami's commentary, in Malayalam, published by Sri Ramakrishna Asram, Puranattukara, Trichur.
9. Tattvamasi by Sukumar Azhikode, published by D.C. Books, Kottayam.
10. Vakyavritti of Sankaracarya by Swaqmi Jagadananda – published by Sri Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Chennai.
11. Atmajnanopadesavidhi of Sankaracarya by Swami Jagadananda – published by Sr Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Chennai.
12. Drg-Drsya-Viveka of SankaraCARYA OR Vidyaranya or Bharati Tirtha by Swami Nikhilananda – published by Sri Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Chennai.
13. Advaita-Siddhi of Madhusudana Saraswati by Karuna Bhattacharya – publoished by Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi.
14. Vicara Sagaram (inHindi) of Sadhu Nischala Das, translated in Sanskrit, with footnotes and explanatrions by Sri Vasudeva Brahmendra Saraswathi Swamigal by Sr Vasudeva Brahmendra Saraswathi Swamigal Library, Mayiladuthrai, Tamil Nadu.
15. Vidyaranya's Pancadasi with commentary in Malayalam by Swami Jnanananda Saraswati, published by Anandakudeeram, Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu.
16. Sankaracarya's Vivekacudamani by Sringeri acarya Swami Chandrasekhara Saraswati (Sanskrit passages of Sankaracarya's Upanishad bhashyams given in brackets have ben taken from publications of Gita Press, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh. Sanskrit passages of Sankaracarya's Brahmasutra Bhashyam have been taken from Motilal Bnardsidas's Sri Sankaracarya Granthavali Sankarabhashopedam Part III.)
17. Tattvamasi by Sulumar Azhikode (in Malayalam)
18. A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy by Chadradhar Sharma (Motilal Banarsidas)

8. Mukti in Advaita Vedanta by A. G. Krishna Warrier (University of Madras)

GLOSSARY

Acala	That which is devoid of movement
Adhishtanam	Sub-stratum. In Advaita Vedanta, the real entity located in which an unreal thing is perceived
Adhyasa	Superimposition. The wrong notion concerning a real entity, attributing to it the nature and characteristics of an unreal thing and vice versa
Advayam	Non-dual . The only Absolute Reality
Agami karma	Punya and papa arising from action and thought in the present janma
Ahambrahmasmi	" I am Brahman"
Ahamkara	Mind cum reflected consciousness
Ajah	That which has no birth
Akasa	Space
Akhanda caitanyam	Undivided, all pervading consciousness
Anadi	That which has no origin
Ananda	Bliss
Anandamaya kosa	Bliss sheath. The ignorance and bliss experienced by a person during deep sleep
Anantam	That which is not limited , space-wise, time-wise or entity-wise. The infinite
Anantam	That which has no end
Anavastha dosha	The fallacy of infinite regress
Anirvacaniyam	Unexplainability; Undefinability
Annamaya kosa	The physical body
Antahkarana	Mind – consisting of Manas, buddhi, ahamkara, and citta
Arthadhyasa	Perception of an unreal entity
Asanga	Unassociated.; relationless
Asuras	Demons

Atma	The Consciousness aspect of Brahman's nature recognized as the witness-consciousness in individual beings.
Avarana sakti	Veiling power. The power of Maya by which Maya makes human beings forget their real nature
Avasthatraya viveka	Enquiry into one's real nature by analyzing the states of waking, dream and deep sleep
Avatara	Incarnation
Avidya	Maya
Ahampratyaya	The 'I' notion part of the mind, the changing 'I' as the knower, doer etc.
Avidya vritti	The mode of the dormant mind in sushupti registering the non-experiencing state.
Avyakruta	Literal meaning is 'unevolved'. However, it is used as a technical term synonymous with Maya
Avyakta	Literal meaning is ' unmanifest'. However, it is used as a technical term synonymous with Maya
Avyavaharyam	That which is beyond transactions
Ayamatama Brahma	"This consciousness which is my real nature is none other than the all pervading consciousness"
Bhashya	Commentary on the scriptural text
Bhokata	Enjoyer or sufferer
Bhokruttvam	The sense that one is an enjoyer or sufferer
Bhrama	(1)Erroneous knowledge (2) Illusion
Brahmaa	Creator-God. The creator aspect of Iswara
Brahman	The Absolute Reality defined as Existence-Consciousness-Bliss
Brahmana	Seeker of knowledge of Brahman; one who has known Brahman
Brahmasatyam jaganmithya	Brahman is the Reality; the universe is mithya
Buddhi	Faculty of the mind which is of the nature of decision - also, the reasoning faculty – generally referred to as the intellect

Caitanyam	Consciousness
Cidabhasa	Reflected Consciousness
Cit	Consciousness
Dama	Control of the sense organs of perception and action
Devas	Gods. Deities
Drkdrsya viveka	Enquiry into one's real nature by analysing the known and the knower
Dwaitam	The existence of more than one reality
Golakam	The physical part of the sense organs
Guna	Attribute
Guru	Preceptor
Hiranyagrha	(1) Brahmaa , the God embodying Iswara's power of creation power (2) Cosmic subtle body
Indriya	The energy of the sense organs
Iswara	Maya cum cidabhasa. Cosmic causal body.
Jagat	The universe
Jagrat avastha	The waking state
Janma	One life span; birth
Jiva	Synonym of jivatma
Jivabrama aikyam	Identity of the essential nature of Jivatma and Paramatma
Jivanmukta	One who has become liberated while living.
Jivanmukti	Liberation from Samsara in the current life itself
Jivatma	The conglomerate of body, mind and atma
Jnana kanda	The latter part of the Veda dealing with Brahman, Jivatmas and jagat
Jnanadhyasa	The wrong notion mistaking a real entity to be an unreal thing.
Jnanam	(1) Consciousness (2) Knowledge
Jnanendriyas	Sense organs of perception – sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch

Jnani	One who has gained knowledge of one's identity with Brahman – jivabrama aikyam. The knowledge that one's real nature is consciousness and that that consciousness is no different from the all pervading consciousness called Brahman
Kamya Karma	Action for selfish ends
Karana sarira	The causal body – the anandamaya kosa
Karma	Action; merit and demerit
Karma kanda	The former part of the Veda dealing with rituals
Karma Yoga	Purificatory spiritual practices as preparation for study of Jnana kanda
Karmaphalam	The enjoyment and suffering undergone by the jivatma for punya and papa
Karmendriyas	Sense organs of action – action through speech, legs, hands, anus and the genitals
Karta	Doer
Kartrutvam	The sense that one is a doer
Krama mukti	Liberation from samsara after going to the abode of Hiranyagarbha by doing Hiranyagarbha or Iswara Upasana and being taught by Hiraanyagarbha himself
Lakshanam	Features ; characteristics ; definition.
Laya	Dissolution of the universe
Mananam	The process of getting doubts clarifies by discussion with the teacher or by one's own analysis and reasoning
Manas	Faculty of mind which is of the nature of indecision or doubt; also the emotional aspect of antahkarana
Manomaya kosa	The mind and the five sense organs of perception
Maya	Unevolved names and forms resting, as a lower of reality, in Brahman
Mithya	That which is experienced but has no real existence of its own
Moksha	Liberation from samsara
Mumukshutvam	Intense yearning for moksha
Nama roopa	Name and form

Nididhyasanam	The process of dwelling on the core of the teaching to overcome the habitual identification with the body mind complex
Nimitta karanam	Intelligent cause
Nirakara	Formless
Niravayava	That which has no parts
Nirguna	Attributeless
Nirvikalpa	Divisionless
Nirvikara	Changeless
Nitya	Eternal
Pancabhootas	The five basic compounds – space, air, fire water and earth
Pancakosa viveka	Enquiry into one's real nature by analyzing the five kosas
Papa	Demerit, i.e., in the system of karma, the debit entry in the ledger, as it were, for bad action or bad thought, to be discharged by imposing suffering on the jivatma in the same birth or in some future birth.
Paramartika satyam	Absolute reality
Paramatma	Brahman
Parinama	Transformation
Prajnaam Brahma	The consciousness which is the nature of the individual is none other than the all pervading consciousness called Brahman
Prakarana grantha	Works expounding Sruti
Prakriti	Literal meaning is 'nature'. However, it is used as a technical term synonymous with Maya
Prama	Right knowledge
Pramanam	The instrument of knowing
Pramata	The knower
Prameyam	The known

Prana	The energy that regulates the physiological functions of living beings – five in number – prana, apana, vyana, samana and udana – responsible for functions such as respiration, circulation, digestion, metabolism, ejection , locomotion, action etc. – generally referred to as 'vital airs'
Pranamaya kosa	The five pranas and the five sense organs of action
Prarabdha karma	The quota of punya and papa allotted to be exhausted by enjoyment or suffering in a particular janam
Pratibhasika satyam	Subjective reality
Pratyabhinja	Recognition.
Pratyagatma	When the all pervading consciousness is referred to as the consciousness recognizable by oneself in oneself, it is called Pratyagatma
Punya	Merit, i.e., in the system of karma, the credit entry in the ledger, as it were, for good action or good thought – to be discharged by conferring enjoyment or comfort on the jivatma in the same birth or in some future birth
Purushartha	(1) Goals in life – material prosperity called artha, enjoyment called kama, merit gained by observance of one's duties in accordance with scriptural commandments and prohibitions called dharma and moksha (2) free will
Sadhana catushtaya	The four fold discipline qualifying for the study of Jnana kanda, consisting of viveka, vairagya, shatka sampatti, and mumukshutvam
Sadhanas	Spiritual practices
Sakshi	When the all pervading consciousness is referred as the consciousness that is the source of the reflected consciousness in the mind and is present throughout when mind has one cognition after another , it is called Sakshi
Sama	Control or mastery over the mind
Samadhana	Single-contended of the mind
Samanvaya	Harmonious interpretation of texts – Sastra mentions six criteria – what is said in the beginning, what is said in the end, what is repeated, what is praised or condemned, what accords with logic and what is said to bring benefit.
Samashti	Macrocosm

Samsara	The cycle of births and deaths, karma and karma phalam punya and papa and enjoyment and suffering.
Sancita karma	The accumulated 'bundle' of punya and papa
Santimantra	Benedictory verse
Sarvagatam	All pervading
Sarvajnah	The omniscient
Sarvasaktiman	The omnipotent
Sarvatmabhava	The sense that one is everything
Sastra	Scripture. Spiritual literature including Sruti, Smriti, Bhashyas, Vartikas, and Prakarana Granthas
Sat	(1)Existence; (2) essence
Satyam	That which exists in all three periods of time
Shatka Sampatti	A six fold mental training consisting of sama dama, uparama, tritiksha, sraddha and samadhana
Siddhi	Superhuman powers
Siva	The God embodying Iswara's power of dissolution
Smriti	Elaborations based on sruti. E.g., Bhagavat Gita. Literal meaning is memory; remembrance
Sraddha	Faith in the teaching of the guru and scriptures
Sravanam	Listening to the teaching of Sastra by a guru
Srishti	Creation of the universe ; the unfolding of names and forms out of Maya
Sruti	Veda, in four compilations – Rg, Yajuh, Sama and Atharva
Sthiti	Maintenance of the universe
Sthoola sarira	The physical body – the annamaya kosa
Sukshma sarira	The subtle body consisting of the pranamaya, manomaya and vijanamaya kosas
Sushupti	The deep sleep state
Sutra	Scriptural work in the form aphorisms

Swapna avastha	The dreaming state
Swaroopam	Intrinsic nature
Tattvamasi	“Thou art That”. The teaching “You, Jivatma are none other than Brahman”
Titiksha	Endurance of discomforts, such as heat, cold etc .Equanimity towards the opposites of pleasure and pain. Acceptance of things and situations without grudging or complaint.
Triputi	The division of the knower, the known and the knowing instrument or the act of knowing – the pramata, the prameyam and the pramanam
Upadana karanam	Material cause
Upadhi	The thing from which characteristics are falsely transferred to an entity that is close by
Upahitam	The entity to which characteristics of a thing close by are falsely transferred
Upanishad	Vedic texts dealing with Brahman, jivatmas and the jagat
Upanishadic	Used as an adjectival form of Upanishad
Uparati	Performance of one’s duty towards himself, the parents, teacher, family, society etc., which involves sacrifice as opposed to insistence on rights which involves demands on others
Upasana	Spiritual meditation
Vairagya	Dispassion – Absence of desire for enjoyment of things of this world as also of other worlds
Vakyam	Sentence
Vartika	Commentary, in verse form ,on the scriptural text
Vasanas	Impressions formed in the mind on account of experiences.
Veda	The original Hindu religious scripture
Vedanta	Janna kanda consisting of the Upanishads
Vedantic	Used as an adjectival for of Vedanta
Videhamukti	Dissolution of the sthoola, sukshma and karana sariras of a Jivanmukta when he dies

Vijanamaya kosa	The intellect and the five sense organs of perception
Vikshepa sakti	Projecting power. The power of Maya that projects the universe of names and forms on Brahman, the sub-stratum of pure Existence and also deludes jivatmas into mistaking the world to be real
Virat	Cosmic physical body
Vishnu	The God embodying the Iswara's power of maintenance of the universe
Vivarta karanam	The cause that produces effect without undergoing any change.
Viveka	Discrimination of the eternal and the ephemeral
Vritti	Thought mode
Vyashti	Microcosm
Vyavaharika satyam	Empirical reality

ABBREVIATIONS

1. AB = Atmabodha
2. Au = Aitereya Upanishad
3. AUB = Aitereya Upanishad Bhashya
4. BSB = Brahmasutra Bhahya
5. B = Bhamati
6. Bu = Brhadaranyaka Upanishad
7. BUB = Brhadaranyaka Upanishad Bhasya
8. BSBV = Brhadaranyaka Upanishad Vartika
9. Ch = Chandogya Upanishad
10. CUB = Chandogya Upanishad Bhashya
11. Kau = Kaivalya Upanishad
12. Ku = Kathopanishad
13. KUB =Kathopanishad Bhashya
14. M = Manasollasa
15. Mau = Mandukya Upanishad
16. Mu = Mundaka Upanishad
17. MUB = Mundaka Upanishad Bhasya
18. NS = Naishkarmyasiddhi
19. PV = Pravanartha Vartika
20. Tu = Tattitriya Upanishad
21. TUB = Taittiriya Upanishad Bhasya
22. TUBV= Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashya Vartika
23. Su = Swesvatara Upanishad
24. US = Upadesa Sahasri

25. V = Vivarana published along with Pancapadika and its other commentaries, Prabodha-parisodini and Tatparya-dyotini and also with commentaries Tatparya-dipika and Bhava-prakasika on it (Madras Government Oriental Series, 1958)
26. VC = Viveka Cudamani